

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 10337) granting a pension to Martha Isabella McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLECZKA: A bill (H. R. 10338) granting a pension to Charles W. Brush; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 10339) for the relief of H. C. Mullins, his wife, and minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 10340) granting an increase of pension to William W. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 10341) to authorize the President of the United States to reappoint Seth William Scofield major of Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 10342) granting a pension to Walter G. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10343) granting an increase of pension to James Braley, alias James Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10344) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Bearden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10345) granting a pension to Belle Cannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Ukrainian National Committee of the United States, Wilmington, Del., and certain citizens of Wilmington, Del., of Ukrainian birth, concerning Ukrainian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEGG: Petition of Fremont Council 591, Knights of Columbus, Fremont, Ohio, protesting against withdrawal of war activities of Knights of Columbus from military and naval camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of sundry citizens of East Peru, Iowa, relative to the supply of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Bronx Property Owners and Business Men's Association, urging early action on House bill 3285; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of Ninetieth Division Association, favoring reasonable amount of universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Newark Military Service Rifle Club, indorsing plan to establish the Caldwell rifle ranges as permanent Government training grounds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Foster-Milburn & Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing Senate bill 2904; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Branch, Ukrainian National Committee of the United States, concerning Ukrainian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of George P. Kimmel, Washington, D. C., regarding conditions in the Patent Office; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of B. Harris, of New York, urging support of certain foreign trading zone bills, House bills 3170 and 9778; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. Park Love, concerning conditions in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ganss Fur Co. (Inc.) and Gross, Engle & Co., both of New York, opposing House bill 9778; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the joint conference on retirement, civil-service employees of the United States, Washington, D. C., concerning status of House bill 3149; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Lithuanian citizens of Newburgh, N. Y., concerning Lithuanian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, opposing House bill 8572; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Knights of Columbus of Crookston, Minn., opposing the proposed internationalization of the war-welfare societies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Al-ko Bottling Works, of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring the passage of the Dalling bill, to govern the exportation of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, November 3, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come reverently into Thy presence and lift our hearts to Thee in the name of the millions of our fellow citizens who believe in prayer, who have seen Thy guiding hand, who have known the answer to their prayers and have sought Thy guidance and blessing upon us in our national life. We pray that Thou wilt hear and answer the prayer of Thy people, continuing Thy grace and blessing to us, leading us in the safe way of national greatness and peace and righteousness and establishing in all the earth the great principles upon which Thou hast established this Nation. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, October 30, 1919, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of useless papers devoid of historic interest on the files of the Interior Department and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce in response to a resolution of the 3d ultimo, which will be inserted in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
Washington, October 30, 1919.

MY DEAR SIR: Respectfully referring to Senate resolution No. 203, of October 3, 1919, hitherto acknowledged under date of October 7, permit me to advise as follows:

Attached hereto are five exhibits. Exhibit A gives the detail of the personnel of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which is that service of the Department of Commerce directly engaged in the work of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States. This document gives in detail the names, positions, salaries, and locations of the entire working force of the service.

Exhibit B is a statement showing the plans of the service for utilizing during the present fiscal year the appropriation for promoting commerce, 1919-20. This states the countries in which work is carried on under this appropriation, the commodities being specially studied, and the other features of this particular work. It should be noted that this is entirely separate and distinct from the following items:

Exhibit C states in similar detail to the above the force and work planned under the appropriation for promoting commerce in the Far East, 1919-20.

Exhibit D states in like detail the work planned for the current fiscal year under the appropriation for promoting commerce in South and Central America.

Exhibit E states the way in which the fund of \$300,000 appropriated for commercial attachés is being expended in different countries abroad.

These five documents taken together give a picture of the organization and work of this service. They cover fully the request of the Senate for "detailed statements covering the character, amount, and estimated cost to the Government of such work as is now being carried on under" the auspices of this department.

It should be noted, however, that the work thus described in detail, which is actively progressing all over the globe, is not the only strictly commercial work of the Department of Commerce. In two other services it functions directly in support of the commerce of the country. The Bureau of Standards provides that scientific basis for industry which has until recently been lacking as a necessary support for our trade. Prior to the war Germany greatly excelled in this important respect, and Great Britain is now taking steps to provide the same basic necessity for her own manufactures. The Bureau of Standards is, however, the largest and best equipped laboratory of the kind in the world, and its normal operations form a solid substructure for the development of a scientific basis for our industries.

The Bureau of Fisheries also has been actively creating new industries, such as the aquatic leather industry and the industry of dyeing, dressing, and finishing furs, in both of which respects this country is advanced over others by reason of this particular work. The Bureau of Fisheries also gives earnest and intelligent care to the promotion of food-preserving industries through its fishery products laboratory and has been instrumental in creating new industries in this connection which are on an established and profitable basis.

Both the work of the Bureau of Fisheries and that of the Bureau of Standards contribute in their respective spheres directly and efficiently to the development of our foreign commerce.

In response to the request embodied in the resolution to submit "such suggestions and recommendations" as may look "to the closer cooperation and coordination of the various agencies of the Govern-

ment for effective promotion of the foreign commerce of the United States," I beg respectfully to state as follows:

The basic statute of the United States upon this subject is the organic act of February 14, 1903 (32 Stat., 825), creating the Department of Commerce and Labor. This act provides as follows:

"It shall be the province and duty of said department to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries, the labor interests, and the transportation facilities of the United States; and to this end it shall be vested with jurisdiction and control of the departments, bureaus, offices, and branches of the public service hereinafter specified and with such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by law."

So much of the foregoing as relates to labor interests was superseded by the act creating the Department of Labor. The provisions respecting mining and transportation facilities are modified by the respective functions of the Bureau of Mines, of the Department of the Interior, of the Railroad Administration, and of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The same is true as regards shipping through the operations of the Shipping Board. As respects, however, the foreign and domestic commerce, the manufacturing and fishery industries, there has been no modification of the organic act above cited. It remains, indeed, so far as its letter is concerned, quite unreppealed save as respects the labor interests. It is to-day in full force and vigor. There is no other department of the Government broadly charged by law to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, etc., of the United States. It is assumed that this law was meant to be taken seriously; that the duties imposed by it upon the Department of Commerce are real duties, and that it should have the authority as well as the responsibility of performing them. It is perhaps not too much to assume that it was the purpose of Congress that the Department of Commerce, within the sphere which is above outlined, should have the same authority and influence that the Treasury Department has in finance, the War and Navy Departments in their respective fields of military effort, the Agriculture Department in the field of agriculture, the Department of State in diplomacy, and, indeed, each of the other executive departments within its nominal scope.

Such, however, is not the case. Other bodies exist who perform in whole or part duties such as those charged by law upon the Department of Commerce. In writing frankly of the actual situation it should be premised that the matter is not discussed in any spirit of complaint, nor is there thought of criticism of persons or of specific bodies. The subject under review is a matter of organization, and the question being discussed is whether our present organization is fitted to cope effectively with the serious commercial problems that face the country.

Any review of the commercial work of the Government must show that the absence of organization is its most conspicuous feature. There is an excess of organizations; too little system. Numerous bodies exist, functioning in the same field or with direct action or reaction therein, each independent, without coordination, without liaison, without the obligation on the part of any of them to inform the others. In short, there exists in our public commercial organization much the same condition that existed in the allied armies before unity of command was secured. It would not be questioned that before that time the commanders of the allied and associated forces were sincere, competent, and devoted men. Each in his own separate sphere was doing his best and trying to support his allies as fully as he could. Just so it is in our Government commercial organization. Different bodies of able and earnest men function separately on commercial subjects at home and abroad, without mutual plan, without frequent consultation, and often in ignorance of what the others are doing.

The War Finance Corporation is given authority to furnish credits to the extent of a billion dollars "in order to promote commerce with foreign nations." The similarity of the language of this appropriation to that of the organic law of the Department of Commerce is notable. The appropriation is made for the express purpose of doing that with which the Department of Commerce is specifically charged by law. There is no doubt this function will be performed well, so far as the law permits, but there is no obligation to coordinate this work with that of the Department of Commerce, although this last is charged by law to "foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce" of the country. The management of the War Finance Corporation has shown marked courtesy to the Department of Commerce, but there is no close cooperation.

The Federal Reserve Board admirably performs a function of vital importance to our commerce and finance. One can only speak of it in terms of approval and admiration, but so far as the Department of Commerce is concerned it functions separately, without obligation of either consultation or of cooperation. It is, however, true that the operations of the Federal Reserve Board lie at the very root of the successful operation of our commerce.

The Interstate Commerce Commission performs functions of high value in our domestic and foreign commercial life, but it performs them as a separate organization. It probably does not occur to the distinguished members of that useful body to either consult or cooperate with the Department of Commerce, or that the latter has any interests or functions in common with it, yet the Interstate Commerce Commission may and does vitally affect the foreign commerce of the country through its rate-making powers. The suggestion would probably be strange to them that they should consult the Department of Commerce before taking action which may control the commerce which the Department of Commerce is especially charged to foster, promote, and develop.

The Shipping Board provides for carrying our commerce to the ends of the earth and, through its officers and representatives abroad, takes an important, if not a vital, part in our commercial activity, but the Department of Commerce is not represented upon the Shipping Board and, except as a matter of courtesy, can not influence or guide it. In some of its foreign offices, particularly in London, the work of the Shipping Board along lines of commercial intelligence parallels that of the Department of Commerce, occupies in considerable degree the same field, and indeed the suggestion has been locally made that the information which the officers of the Department of Commerce in London secure should be turned over to the Shipping Board office there for its use. The supercargoes of the Shipping Board, we are informed by that body, are instructed to gather commercial intelligence in all the ports to which they go. They have in the past communicated this information to the Department of Commerce for its use, but there is no obligation to do so. It has been a courtesy on their part.

The Federal Trade Commission has duties of high importance vitally affecting our domestic and foreign trade, but no representative of the Department of Commerce forms a portion of that body, nor is there existing any obligation for that commission to function in close rela-

tion with the Department of Commerce. It will be noted that the Federal Trade Commission is given the supervision over the combinations permitted by law for developing foreign trade. This is a function which falls directly within the organic law of the Department of Commerce.

The International High Commission, of which the Secretary of the Treasury is the ex officio chairman, is a composite body representing the United States and the other American Republics. It has distinctly commercial functions, among them the provision of uniform regulations for commercial travelers, of uniform arrangements for the classification of merchandise, for customs regulations, for consular certificates and invoices, and port charges. It gives special consideration to the protection of patents and trade-marks and deals with the extension of arbitration for adjusting commercial disputes. It is a useful and dignified body, whose work touches closely that of the Department of Commerce. It is in no respect inharmonious, but it is separate. The Department of Commerce has no legal relation to it. A list of its publications is found upon page 59 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, on the Diplomatic and Consular Service appropriation bill, under date of December 11, 1918. It should be noted, however, that as regards trade-marks the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of this department, actively operates in the protection of American trade-marks abroad and maintains a special section occupied in no small part in advising and informing American manufacturers on that subject.

The Railroad Administration, through its power to embargo freights, to grant or remove export rates, may at times exercise a controlling power over both our domestic and foreign commerce, but it has under the law no relation to the Department of Commerce and, save a matter of courtesy, does not assume that there is any joint field of endeavor.

The Department of State, for reasons admitted by all to be good and sufficient, maintains foreign trade advisers and a force for the purpose of gathering foreign trade information. The relation between that department, especially through its Consular Service and the foreign-trade advisers, and the Department of Commerce is intimate and cordial. It has been a privilege to express admiration for the fine and fruitful work of the Consular Service. There is a "no man's land" wherein the diplomatic field runs parallel with the commercial and the commercial field touches closely upon the diplomatic. It will probably always be necessary to maintain a species of joint endeavor between the two departments. There is, however, no duplication of work. The commercial results of the work of the officers of the Department of State are made available through the Department of Commerce and are supplemented and completed, not duplicated, by the work of the officers of the Department of Commerce in the foreign field. The Department of State can never be promotive in a commercial sense. The Department of Commerce can never do diplomatic work. The two fields touch, but they do not cross. They are complementary, not antagonistic. There is no legal requirement at the present time calling for cooperation between the two services, but there is a very generous spirit of cooperation and sincere mutual respect and helpfulness.

The Agricultural Department, through several services, assists or supervises large commercial transactions at home and abroad, and does so ably and with advantage to the country.

Again, let it be emphasized that the relations between these various bodies are not frictional, but cordial. The men comprising the various groups are friends. They realize they are working to a common end. I repeat, the question is not one of individuals but one of organization. There can be no clear-cut commercial policy carried out by separate bodies that do not interfunction. Any industrial organization composed as is the commercial organization of the Government would fall, for the seeds of decay are planted in the very separateness of the component parts. It is not urged that these bodies should cease to be or that their functions should be altered. There are separate duties belonging to each, although many of those duties lie in a common field with the Department of Commerce.

It is, however, strongly urged that each and every one of these separate services, except the Departments of State and Agriculture, should be linked formally to that department which alone the law charges with the duty to "foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce" of the country.

Is there sound reason why there should not be a representative of the Department of Commerce upon the War Finance Corporation, upon the Federal Reserve Board, upon the Federal Trade Commission, upon the Shipping Board, upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon the International High Commission, or upon the Railroad Administration? If such reason exists, what is it? On the other hand, is it the public purpose and intent that the department charged to "foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce" of the country should do it only in part, subject to the kindly and unintentional but nevertheless real competition and control of others charged, indeed, with some different duties but acting within the same commercial area?

Either the Department of Commerce should be so organized as to perform its important function effectively or it should not. If it should not do so, then the organic law dictating its functions should be modified and it should cease to be in name what it is hardly in fact, the Department of Commerce. Or, on the other hand, it should be recognized that it is the focus of commercial organization on the part of the Government and as such these various independent bodies should so be headed up into it that the world of commerce at home and abroad may know there is one center for commerce as there is one for agriculture, as there is one for war, as there is one for the Navy, and not a congeries of unrelated parts which operate, indeed, in personal harmony and peace but without those effective results which can come alone from systematic and unified effort.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
President the United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A.

Bureau employees:	
Washington	177
Foreign service	105
District offices	32
Total	314

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Country to which assigned and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
Great Britain:			
Commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		\$7,500
Trade commissioner ¹	Brook, H. G.....	July 1, 1918	4,500
Do.....	Gary, L. B.....	Jan. 23, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Grady, H. F.....	Feb. 1, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Page, W. J.....	Sept. 16, 1919	5,000
Do.....	Powell, F. W.....	Feb. 8, 1919	3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Oseland, Z. C.....	Jan. 25, 1918	1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Walker, A. M.....	Mar. 4, 1919	2,000
Do.....	Park, W. M.....	Oct. 1, 1919	2,500
France:			
Commercial attaché.....	Snow, C. D.....	July 1, 1919	7,500
Trade commissioner ¹	Adams, H. W.....	Oct. 1, 1919	4,000
Do.....	Butler, J. F.....	Mar. 27, 1919	3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Hunt, L. W.....	Aug. 11, 1919	1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Breckheimer, P. J.....	Feb. 18, 1919	2,000
Do.....	Masuret, E. A.....	Sept. 2, 1919	2,000
Do.....	Sweetser, H. A.....	Dec. 16, 1918	2,500
Japan:			
Commercial attaché.....	Abbott, J. F.....	Jan. 11, 1919	6,000
Trade commissioner.....	Weimer, J. G.....	July 1, 1919	4,500
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Long, C. V.....	Jan. 25, 1919	1,500
Denmark:			
Commercial attaché.....	Anderson, N. L.....	July 1, 1919	6,500
Trade commissioner.....	Klath, T. O.....	Jan. 27, 1919	3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	do.....		2,000
Brazil:			
Commercial attaché.....	Philippi, J. E.....	Aug. 15, 1918	7,000
Assistant trade commissioner.....	Counell, R. M.....	Sept. 1, 1919	2,500
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Spain:			
Commercial attaché.....	Jones, C. L.....	Jan. 17, 1919	6,500
Trade commissioner.....	Strachan, W. M.....	Jan. 16, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Vacant.....		3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Cron, L. L.....	July 1, 1919	1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Googe, W. D.....	Jan. 27, 1919	2,250
Do.....	Vacant.....		2,000
The Hague:			
Commercial attaché.....	Edwards, P. L.....	Jan. 1, 1918	5,000
Trade commissioner ¹	Radfield, A. H.....	Jan. 17, 1919	3,000
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vander Laan, J. W.....	Feb. 1, 1919	2,000
Mexico:			
Commercial attaché.....	Feeley, E. F.....	July 7, 1919	6,000
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	McIntyre, F. P.....	July 26, 1919	1,500
Russia:			
Commercial attaché.....	Huntington, W. C.....	May 1, 1916	5,000
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Fitzpatrick, J. R.....	Aug. 28, 1919	1,500
Trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		4,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	do.....		2,000
China:			
Commercial attaché.....	Arnold, J. H.....	Dec. 30, 1914	8,000
Trade commissioner ¹	Batchelder, C. C.....	Aug. 25, 1919	5,475
Do.....	Meehins, L. W.....	June 16, 1919	4,000
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Leo, C. F.....	June 1, 1917	1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Dormady, F. P.....	Sept. 10, 1919	2,250
Do.....	Smith, R. R.....	July 21, 1919	2,000
Argentina:			
Commercial attaché.....	Klein, Julius.....	May 1, 1919	7,000
Trade commissioner ¹	Brady, G. S.....	Sept. 9, 1919	3,650
Assistant trade commissioner.....	Noll, B. H.....	July 11, 1919	2,500
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Italy:			
Commercial attaché.....	Dennis, A. P.....	Jan. 2, 1919	6,000
Trade commissioner ¹	Chiesa, M. J.....	Jan. 25, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Maclean, H. C.....	Feb. 1, 1919	3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Hudson, R. G.....	Mar. 5, 1919	2,000
Do.....	Osborne, A. A.....	Feb. 1, 1919	2,500
Belgium:			
Trade commissioner ¹	Collins, H. T.....	Feb. 3, 1919	4,380
Do.....	Herring, C. E.....	June 16, 1918	4,000
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Prosser, W. L.....	Feb. 3, 1919	2,000
Czechoslovakia:			
Trade commissioner.....	Geringer, V. A.....	Mar. 28, 1919	4,000
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Jalovec, Louis.....	Apr. 16, 1919	2,000
Switzerland:			
Trade commissioner ²	Groves, H. L.....	Sept. 6, 1919	4,000
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		2,000
Roumania: Clerk to trade commissioner ¹	Lane, W. E.....	Feb. 4, 1919	2,250
Poland:			
Trade commissioner ²	Van Norman, L. E.....	Oct. 1, 1919	5,000
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		2,000
Norway: Clerk to trade commissioner ¹	Anda, Magnus.....	Feb. 6, 1919	2,000
Australia:			
Trade commissioner.....	Ferrin, A. W.....	Jan. 1, 1919	4,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		1,800
Turkey:			
Trade commissioner.....	Mears, E. G.....	Feb. 1, 1919	4,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Huse, H. R.....	Feb. 21, 1919	2,250
Austria:			
Trade commissioner ²	Upson, W. F.....	Sept. 29, 1919	4,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		2,000
Peru:			
Trade commissioner ²	Jackson, Carlton.....	Sept. 8, 1919	3,650
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		2,000

¹On duty in United States finishing reports.²Making preparations in United States for departure to post of duty.³Temporary, pending arrival of successor.⁴In United States preparing for departure to post of duty.

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Continued.

Territory and position.	Investigation.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
Latin America:				
Trade commissioner	General commercial conditions, Colombia and Venezuela.	Bell, P. L.....	Sept. 23, 1918	\$3,650
Do. ¹	Furniture markets.	Everley, H. E.....	Mar. 12, 1917	3,650
Do. ¹	Construction materials.	Ewing, W. W.....	July 20, 1916	3,650
Do. ¹	Textiles.	Garrv, Louis.....	Dec. 16, 1918	3,650
Do. ¹	Jewelry and silverware.	Rosenthal, S. W.....	June 11, 1917	3,650
Do.....	General commercial conditions, Peru and Bolivia.	Schurz, W. L.....	Feb. 1, 1919	3,650
Do. ³	Factory equipment.	Smith, P. S.....	Sept. 8, 1919	5,000
South Africa: Trade commissioner.	General commercial conditions.	Lundquist, R. A.....	Aug. 15, 1916	3,650
Europe:				
Trade commissioner ¹	Lumber markets.	Brown, N. C.....	Apr. 29, 1917	3,650
Do. ¹	do.	Oxholm, A. H.....	Oct. 28, 1916	3,650
Do. ¹	do.	Simmons, R. E.....	Apr. 27, 1917	3,650
Do. ¹	General commercial conditions.	Wells, L. C.....	Mar. 17, 1919	3,650
Do. ¹	Ban dng opportunities.	Young, A. A.....	Jan. 18, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Electrical markets.	Wood, C. P.....	Feb. 3, 1919	4,250
Do.....	General commercial conditions.	Cutler, B. S.....	July 14, 1919	6,000
Do.....	Mining.	DeKalb, C.....	Mar. 1, 1919	4,500
Do.....	Leather.	Hertz, Norman.....	Mar. 4, 1919	3,650
United States:				
Trade commissioner	Commercial conditions.	Harris, Garrard.....	Aug. 29, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Transportation facilities.	Hooker, G. E.....	July 10, 1919	4,000
Expert.....	Stowage of ship cargoes.	Taylor, T. R.....	Sept. 2, 1919	3,000
Trade commissioner	Foreign trade complaints.	Messe, N. S.....	Sept. 20, 1919	1,400
Clerk to trade commissioner.	do.	Cabot, H. V.....	do.....	1,200
Far East:				
Trade commissioner	Mineral resources.	Clements, J. M.....	Mar. 5, 1917	5,475
Do. ²	Advertising methods.	Sanger, J. W.....	Oct. 1, 1919	4,015
Do.....	General commercial conditions, East India and Straits Settlements.	Fowler, J. A.....	Nov. 25, 1918	3,650
Do.....	Industrial machinery.	Rastall, W. H.....	Oct. 30, 1918	5,475
Do. ²	Industrial development of Japan.	Rutter, F. R.....	Oct. 1, 1919	4,000
Do.....	Ports and transportation facilities.	Whitham, P. P.....	Feb. 14, 1917	5,475

¹On duty in United States finishing reports.²In United States preparing for departure to post of duty.

Division or office and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
WASHINGTON OFFICE.			
Director:			
Director of bureau.....	Kennedy, P. B.....	Aug. 1, 1919	\$6,000
Private secretary.....	Vacant.....		1,800
Stenographer.....	Steele, P. W.....	Apr. 2, 1917	1,400
Messenger.....	Johnson, C. N.....	Oct. 11, 1907
First assistant director:			
First assistant director.....	MacElwee, R. S.....	Feb. 1, 1919	3,500
Stenographer.....	Challice, A. M.....	Feb. 17, 1919	1,200
Second assistant director:			
Second assistant director.....	Vacant.....		3,000
Stenographer.....	Steward, Elma.....	Mar. 7, 1917	1,400
Chief clerk:			
Chief clerk.....	Eckhardt, N.....	Aug. 5, 1898	2,250
Assistant chief clerk.....	Dotterer, H.....	Oct. 5, 1914	2,000
Stenographer.....	Towles, E. A.....	Mar. 1, 1915	1,400
Clerk.....	Smith, G. W.....	Aug. 15, 1907	1,400
Stenographer.....	Solomon, G. F.....	Nov. 19, 1917	1,200
Messenger.....	Coleman, Henry.....	Oct. 2, 1896	840
Assistant messenger.....	Shaw, Maudie.....	May 14, 1918	720
Do.....	Page, W. J.....	Mar. 25, 1918	720
Messenger boy.....	Parkinson, L. J.....	Dec. 31, 1918	420
Auditing section—			
Chief of section.....	Haun, H. W.....	Nov. 15, 1911	2,500
Clerk.....	Fehr, Jules.....	Oct. 5, 1914	1,600

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Continued.

Division or office and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
WASHINGTON OFFICE—continued.			
Chief clerk—Continued.			
Auditing section—Continued.			
Clerk.....	Johnson, C. C.....	July 19, 1911	\$1,500
Do.....	Guinn, P. S.....	Nov. 20, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Jones, Mae.....	Nov. 4, 1918	1,200
Stenographer.....	De Roche, L. M.....	Nov. 16, 1917	1,200
Clerk.....	Eastman, M. B.....	July 22, 1918	1,000
Files section—			
Clerk in charge.....	Smith, W. F.....	Jan. 17, 1916	1,800
Clerk.....	Worthington, G.....	July 9, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Hughes, Ruth.....	Dec. 1, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Hallan, H. J.....	Aug. 1, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Masi, J. W.....	Nov. 4, 1916	1,200
Do.....	Smith, Helen.....	Aug. 20, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Williams, M. S.....	May 1, 1919	1,000
Distribution section—			
Clerk in charge.....	Naghten, W. A.....	Mar. 20, 1907	1,800
Clerk.....	Toomey, V. R.....	Mar. 19, 1917	1,400
Do.....	Kidwell, L. T.....	Dec. 7, 1914	1,200
Do.....	Corlew, H. J.....	Jan. 21, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Entwistle, M. K.....	Sept. 25, 1918	900
Do.....	Skorup, Joseph.....	June 2, 1919	900
Do.....	DeBirny, A. W.....	Sept. 15, 1919	900
Supplies and printing—			
Clerk in charge.....	Chadwick, A. S.....	Dec. 8, 1909	1,600
Clerk.....	Dillon, R. E.....	Jan. 2, 1919	1,200
Stenographer.....	Flehr, Etteline.....	May 1, 1918	1,200
Assistant messenger.....	Griffin, F. T.....	Jan. 7, 1919	720
Mails—			
Clerk in charge.....	Howard, F. F.....	July 16, 1881	1,400
Clerk.....	Wallace, S. W.....	Aug. 1, 1915	1,000
Assistant messenger.....	Sodars, N. W.....	June 10, 1919	720
Latin American:			
Chief of division.....	McQueen, C. A.....	Sept. 6, 1918	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Blalock, S. H.....	Aug. 10, 1919	2,000
Translator.....	Hole, M. C.....	Sept. 1, 1909	1,800
Do.....	Warren, R. J.....	Nov. 22, 1917	1,400
Clerk.....	Starbird, A. A.....	Mar. 20, 1917	1,400
Do.....	Kirk, Mary.....	Dec. 10, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Frost, B. M.....	Dec. 15, 1917	1,400
Translator.....	Phoebus, M. A.....	Nov. 14, 1917	1,400
Clerk.....	Butterworth, R.....	Mar. 1, 1919	1,300
Stenographer.....	Montz, V. A.....	Oct. 16, 1917	1,200
Clerk.....	Thompson, M. C.....	Mar. 10, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Gaines, E. O.....	Mar. 1, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Bennett, J. L.....	Apr. 8, 1918	1,200
Far Eastern:			
Chief of division.....	Eldridge, F. R.....	Aug. 6, 1918	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Pendergast, R. P.....	Aug. 26, 1919	2,000
Stenographer.....	McKelvey, A. E.....	Jan. 21, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Beery, Mary.....	Oct. 21, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Pugh, M. A.....	Oct. 17, 1919	1,200
Clerk.....	Pauly, E. A.....	Dec. 10, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Nunn, J. H.....	July 1, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Rice, R. K.....	July 17, 1919	900
Do.....	Bodmer, M.....	Aug. 4, 1919	900
District offices:			
Chief of division.....	Vacant.....		
Stenographer.....	Faulkner, Ora.....	Mar. 19, 1917	1,400
Russian:			
Expert.....	Balevsky, B. M.....	Mar. 27, 1919	2,000
Translator.....	Grodzicka, S.....	Mar. 1, 1919	1,400
Stenographer.....	Nelson, M. H.....	Dec. 20, 1918	1,200
Foreign Investigations:			
Chief of division.....	Butler, H. D.....	Apr. 4, 1919	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Breyere, E. J.....	Oct. 5, 1914	1,800
Clerk.....	Fortier, J. A.....	June 9, 1919	1,200
Stenographer.....	Freeman, E. H.....	Jan. 6, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Walton, V. H.....	Dec. 2, 1918	900
Messenger boy.....	Trathen, James.....	Oct. 20, 1919	420
Commercial Attaché:			
Chief of division.....	Stevenson, P. J.....	Nov. 25, 1913	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Miller, W. L.....	Feb. 4, 1919	1,400
Stenographer.....	Murray, H. D.....	Apr. 1, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Goehring, R. E.....	Mar. 17, 1919	1,000
Foreign Tariffs:			
Chief of division.....	Domeratzky, L.....	July 13, 1906	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Moles, O. C.....	Apr. 13, 1915	2,000
Stenographer.....	Frieker, M. H.....	Nov. 6, 1911	1,600
Translator.....	Kendrick, E. M.....	Jan. 13, 1919	1,400
Do.....	Wakefield, R. P.....	July 9, 1917	1,400
Stenographer.....	Gentzler, K. L.....	Feb. 17, 1919	1,000
Research:			
Chief of division.....	Schmeckebier, L. E.....	May 24, 1917	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Robertson, J. A.....	May 11, 1918	2,500
Do.....	Whitney, Ed.....	Aug. 4, 1899	2,250
Commercial economist.....	Kral, J. J.....	July 20, 1911	2,750
Expert in commerce and finance.....	Towles, J. K.....	Jan. 2, 1919	2,000
Research clerk.....	Hoare, H. M.....	Feb. 23, 1912	1,800
Translator.....	Lamore, B. H.....	Jan. 18, 1918	1,800
Do.....	Bowers, Blanche.....	Aug. 1, 1918	1,400
Research clerk.....	Staples, C. L.....	Jan. 7, 1918	1,400
Clerk.....	Batman, M. T.....	Nov. 21, 1918	1,200
Translator.....	Marlowe, A. R.....	July 27, 1918	1,200
Clerk.....	Weems, W. O.....	Sept. 1, 1918	1,200
Stenographer.....	Smith, Sarah.....	Dec. 19, 1918	1,200
Clerk.....	Swift, A. H.....	Nov. 5, 1918	1,000
Laborer.....	Bradley, E.....	Sept. 12, 1912	600
Trade Information:			
Chief of division.....	Brasel, R. H.....	Nov. 5, 1906	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Croghan, P. J.....	Aug. 20, 1914	1,800
Correspondence clerk.....	Goldberg, B.....	Feb. 25, 1915	1,600
Do.....	Mallory, W. L.....	May 5, 1919	1,400

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Continued.

Division or office and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
WASHINGTON OFFICE—continued.			
Trade Information—Continued.			
Clerk.....	Moore, L. M.....	Jan. 22, 1913	\$1,400
Do.....	Gruber, H. W.....	Apr. 7, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Hughes, L. A.....	Dec. 1, 1917	1,200
Stenographer.....	Lyddans, L. A.....	Nov. 16, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Chappel, A. M.....	July 17, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Roshford, J. S.....	Dec. 16, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Gardner, R.....	Jan. 1, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Gardner, L. G.....	do.....	1,000
Do.....	MacFarland, Alice.....	Nov. 18, 1918	1,000
Clerk.....	Lamitan, R. A.....	July 1, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Fuller, W. S.....	Feb. 7, 1905	1,000
Do.....	Bryant, J. L.....	Dec. 17, 1918	900
Do.....	Carolee Speake.....	July 21, 1919	900
Do.....	Swain, A. M.....	Aug. 27, 1919	900
Statistical:			
Chief of division.....	Hohn, John.....	Feb. 25, 1901	2,500
Do.....	Asmuth, Walter.....	Aug. 1, 1902	2,500
Clerk.....	Sleppy, E. W.....	Mar. 21, 1891	1,800
Do.....	Thrall, J. G.....	Apr. 10, 1901	1,800
Do.....	Daniel, J. W.....	Oct. 2, 1835	1,800
Do.....	Wheeler, C. E.....	Aug. 20, 1910	1,800
Do.....	Cohen, M. H.....	Aug. 16, 1903	1,800
Do.....	Scott, Winfield.....	Jan. 9, 1901	1,800
Do.....	Ingram, Beryl.....	July 23, 1910	1,600
Do.....	Jeffrey, J. H.....	Oct. 10, 1903	1,600
Do.....	Ludwig, E. F.....	Oct. 6, 1902	1,600
Do.....	Grist, B. A.....	July 10, 1907	1,600
Do.....	Daly, P. M.....	Aug. 16, 1901	1,600
Do.....	Black, M. E.....	July 20, 1914	1,600
Do.....	McDuffie, J. A.....	Sept. 17, 1881	1,600
Do.....	Eddingfield, W. T.....	Aug. 17, 1903	1,500
Do.....	Dent, T. M.....	June 1, 1903	1,400
Do.....	Litchfield, F. W.....	Oct. 11, 1903	1,400
Do.....	Welch, B. T.....	Jan. 6, 1874	1,400
Do.....	Young, E. R.....	Jan. 8, 1893	1,400
Do.....	Watson, J. W.....	Apr. 3, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Scott, W. H.....	Sept. 12, 1901	1,200
Do.....	O'Connor, John.....	Apr. 23, 1917	1,200
Do.....	McRae, V. E.....	Aug. 1, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Schmeckel, T.....	Sept. 23, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Thomson, G. H.....	Jan. 16, 1880	1,200
Do.....	Du Bois, A. W.....	Sept. 27, 1914	1,200
Do.....	Rice, E. J.....	Nov. 7, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Mann, E. A.....	Dec. 31, 1918	1,200
Stenographer.....	Duffy, E. E.....	Aug. 29, 1918	1,000
Clerk.....	Fowler, L. H.....	Mar. 27, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Hiner, I. M.....	Oct. 23, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Turner, Jettie.....	Aug. 6, 1919	900
Do.....	Batcheller, E. L.....	Sept. 15, 1919	900
Editorial:			
Chief of division.....	Hopkins, O. P.....	Apr. 18, 1911	2,500
Editorial assistant.....	Evans, Griffith.....	Sept. 21, 1909	2,000
Expert editor.....	Collier, J. H.....	July 16, 1916	2,000
Editor.....	Peirce, F. L.....	Mar. 22, 1916	1,800
Do.....	Hopkins, I.....	Nov. 3, 1913	1,800
Do.....	Cain, M. D.....	July 7, 1903	1,800
Clerk.....	Lille, J. H.....	Oct. 21, 1907	1,600
Editor.....	Gunn, Miriam.....	July 14, 1917	1,400
Do.....	Kavanaugh, K.....	June 23, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Piper, D. E.....	Feb. 1, 1919	1,400
Clerk.....	Greenfield, Cora.....	July 15, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Strocker, A. W.....	Aug. 16, 1916	1,200
Do.....	Myers, Ruth.....	Oct. 9, 1918	1,200
Editor.....	Darlington, L. C.....	Apr. 17, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Collins, J. B.....	Jan. 16, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Bowers, E. C.....	Apr. 2, 1919	1,000
Clerk.....	Blakeney, A. E.....	June 20, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Ash, W. O.....	Oct. 3, 1919	900
District offices in United States and position.			
New York:			
District office manager.....	Clark, A. R.....	Feb. 1, 1919	\$4,000
Commercial agent.....	Barnard, A. J.....	May 15, 1919	2,500
Do.....	Zwickel, E. M.....	Dec. 16, 1919	1,600
Do.....	Bauer, G. F.....	May 28, 1919	1,400
Clerk.....	Hutchinson, A. E.....	Aug. 21, 1916	1,400
Do.....	Bennett, F. D.....	Nov. 19, 1917	1,400
Do.....	Marcus, J.....	May 8, 1919	1,400
Do.....	Schwing, C. A.....	July 20, 1916	1,400
Do.....	Turner, H. L.....	Apr. 22, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Friedland, R.....	July 2, 1917	1,000
Do.....	Meyer, I. M.....	Jan. 20, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Galvin, F. E.....	Feb. 5, 1919	1,000
Messenger boy.....	Schwenger, E. W.....	Jan. 21, 1918	600
Boston:			
District office manager.....	Fuller, T. J. D., jr.....	Mar. 8, 1913	3,000
Clerk.....	Donohue, M. C.....	Mar. 12, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Greene, F. A.....	Oct. 16, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Duffy, M. A.....	May 1, 1918	1,000
Chicago:			
District office manager.....	Stancill, R. L.....	June 1, 1919	3,000
Commercial agent.....	Kunning, P. W.....	Feb. 3, 1919	1,400
Clerk.....	Lydon, T. A.....	Nov. 19, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Worsley, A. R.....	Oct. 16, 1918	1,000
Seattle:			
District office manager.....	Vacant.....		3,000
Clerk.....	Sealey, H. D.....	Feb. 11, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Ayers, L.....	Jan. 18, 1919	1,000

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Continued.

District offices in United States and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
San Francisco:			
District office manager.....	Babbitt, E. G.....	Apr. 13, 1915	\$3,000
Clerk.....	de Navarro, C.....	Feb. 1, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Costello, M.....	Apr. 7, 1919	1,200
St. Louis:			
District office manager.....	Gaukel, T. L.....	Feb. 1, 1919	2,000
Clerk.....	Hartnett, J. M.....	July 22, 1918	1,200
New Orleans:			
District office manager.....	Thompson, E. W.....	Oct. 1, 1919	3,000
Clerk.....	Husson, H. C.....	Mar. 1, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Dieck, A.....	May 6, 1919	1,000

EXHIBIT B.

Activities being conducted and those contemplated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the appropriation for promoting commerce, Department of Commerce, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920:

ESTIMATED COST FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.

General commercial studies:	
England.....	\$9,650
Italy.....	2,250
Netherlands.....	5,750
Norway.....	3,050
France.....	7,750
Switzerland.....	7,475
Maintaining trade commissioners:	
Australasia.....	9,700
Belgium.....	16,700
Czechoslovakia.....	11,450
Denmark.....	8,900
France.....	16,175
Italy.....	11,400
Poland.....	9,775
Roumania.....	2,800
Spain.....	13,400
The Levant.....	11,400
United Kingdom.....	17,350
Austria.....	8,850
India.....	7,600
Germany.....	6,200
South Russia.....	7,100
Commodity investigation:	
Agricultural implements, France.....	1,280
Banking and currency, Spain.....	2,325
Electrical goods, Italy.....	1,550
Electrical goods, Spain.....	1,000
Industrial machinery, France.....	3,500
Industrial machinery, Italy.....	1,150
Leather and raw stock.....	1,500
Lumber markets and industry.....	5,885
Machine tools.....	1,000
Mineral resources, Spain.....	4,850
Transportation and inland waterways.....	5,850
Promoting interest in foreign trade in the Southern States.....	5,000
Investigation and adjusting commercial complaints.....	2,500
Shipping investigation.....	85
Special investigation.....	5,000
Electrical goods.....	8,600
Report on shipping.....	1,250
Industrial machinery.....	3,000
District office service:	
New York.....	22,250
Boston.....	7,200
Chicago.....	7,000
St. Louis.....	4,650
Seattle.....	5,100
San Francisco.....	5,100
New Orleans.....	6,850
Miscellaneous:	
Temporary travel and other special service.....	9,000
Contingent expenses.....	6,500
Total appropriation.....	325,000

EXHIBIT C.

Activities being conducted and those contemplated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the appropriation for pro-1920:

ESTIMATED COST FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.

General commercial studies:	
Shanghai.....	\$11,000
Peking.....	9,000
Dutch East Indies.....	7,700
Tokyo.....	8,000
Commodity investigations:	
Advertising methods.....	\$7,000
Industrial machinery.....	6,000
Mineral resources.....	9,300
Ports and transportation.....	12,800
Miscellaneous:	
Administration and office force in Washington.....	20,000
Contingent expenses.....	4,000
Temporary travel and other special services.....	2,500
Reserved for contingencies.....	2,700
Total appropriation.....	100,000

EXHIBIT D.

Activities being conducted and those contemplated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the appropriation for promoting commerce, South and Central America, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920:

ESTIMATED COST FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.

General commercial studies:	
Argentina.....	\$9,415
Brazil.....	4,750
Colombia and Venezuela.....	7,500
Paraguay and Bolivia.....	7,300
West Indies.....	3,500
Peru.....	8,265
Commodity investigations:	
Advertising methods.....	1,500
Construction materials.....	3,325
Factory equipment.....	7,600
Furniture markets.....	2,600
Jewelry markets.....	3,000
Leather and raw stock.....	6,250
Textiles.....	3,500
Banking and finance.....	3,125
Miscellaneous:	
Administration and office force in Washington.....	20,000
Temporary travel and other special services.....	3,000
Contingent expenses.....	3,000
Reserve for contingencies.....	2,270
Total appropriation.....	100,000

EXHIBIT E.

Activities being conducted and those contemplated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the appropriation for commercial attachés, Department of Commerce, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920:

ESTIMATED COST FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.

Foreign field stations:	
The Hague, Netherlands.....	\$10,300
Buenos Aires, Argentina.....	12,200
Copenhagen, Denmark.....	11,700
London, England.....	11,900
Madrid, Spain.....	11,950
Mexico City, Mexico.....	10,450
Paris, France.....	11,650
Peking, China.....	14,800
Petrograd, Russia (provisionally).....	11,100
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.....	11,250
Rome, Italy.....	11,750
Santiago de Chile, Chile (provisionally).....	10,000
Tokyo, Japan.....	9,200
Lima, Peru.....	8,200
Miscellaneous:	
Contingent expenses.....	6,000
Temporary travel and other special services.....	2,550
Total appropriation.....	185,000

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Director General of Railroads in response to a resolution of the 3d ultimo, which will be inserted in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 31, 1919.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of resolution of the Senate of the United States (S. 203), dated October 3, 1919, requesting certain information in regard to the activities of the United States Railroad Administration in connection with the foreign commerce of the United States.

The Railroad Administration has endeavored to assist in the restoration of the movement of foreign traffic by the application of reasonable rates, rules, and regulations, such as are consistent with present conditions. To assist in determining what property might be done, it has conferred with and secured data from various departments of the Government and worked with them in that manner to cooperate in fostering, promoting, and developing the foreign commerce of the United States. The Railroad Administration is represented on the economic liaison committee organized by the Department of State.

There is no assigned division or department of the Railroad Administration devoted to the fostering, promoting, and developing of foreign commerce.

The Railroad Administration is not involved directly in the gathering of data used or the expense incident thereto, but only in the proper transportation of the traffic as developed and offered for shipment within the United States. A great many railroad employees who are generally engaged in the handling of traffic are, to an extent, involved in the handling of import and export traffic; it is an incident of the general business of the carriers. The foreign freight agents employed on the individual railroads are employed in facilitating the transfer, including the necessary customhouse business, of traffic between the ocean carriers and the inland rail carriers, their functions being performance of service rather than primarily the fostering, promoting, and development of foreign commerce. They are a part of the organization maintained by the railroad corpora-

tions prior to Federal control, which will doubtless be maintained by such corporations after the termination of Federal control.

Very truly, yours,

WALKER D. HINES,
Director General of Railroads.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

USELESS PAPERS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Civil Service Commission, requesting action looking to the disposition of useless papers devoid of historic interest on the files of the commission. The communication will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2883) authorizing the Meridian Highway Bridge Co., a corporation, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between Yankton County, S. Dak., and Cedar County, Nebr.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 425) to establish the Zion National Park in the State of Utah, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SINNOTT, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, and Mr. HAYS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2775) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SINNOTT, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, Mr. ELSTON, Mr. FERRIS, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1024. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of an equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colo.;

H. R. 3258. An act for the relief of Julius Jonas;

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the change of the name of the steamer *Charlotte Graveract Breitung* to *T. K. Maher*;

H. R. 7030. An act for the relief of Martin Goldsmith; and

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1919.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3258. An act for the relief of Julius Jonas; and

H. R. 7030. An act for the relief of Martin Goldsmith.

H. R. 1024. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of an equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colo., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the change of the name of the steamer *Charlotte Graveract Breitung* to *T. K. Maher*, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1919, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram from the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, of Detroit, Mich., which will be inserted in the RECORD.

The telegram is as follows:

[Telegram.]

DETROIT, MICH., November 1, 1919.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

The executive committee of the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association desires to express through you to the Senate of the United States its unqualified approval of the Senate's courageous and praiseworthy action in the support given to the President's position touching the pending coal strike. This association represents in a very large way the retail lumber industry of America, which comprehends in the neighborhood of 70,000 retail lumber yards. In session to-day we have

made a careful survey of the results of the strike as it will affect our industry, and we wish to call your attention to the fact that an interrupted supply of coal at this time will very materially interfere with not only the manufacture but the distribution of the large supply of lumber which is now called for by the people of this country for the purpose of furnishing shelter and homes so urgently needed. The need of the hour is that those in authority shall uphold the laws of the land and our constitutional institutions.

NATIONAL RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have before me a petition signed by, I believe, some 67 merchants of the city of Dayton and vicinity in the State of Ohio in support of the Kenyon bill. It seems that heretofore these petitioners signed a memorial protesting against the bill. I ask that the petition be incorporated in the RECORD without the signatures and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 26, 1919.

TO OUR SENATORS:

We, the undersigned merchants of Dayton and vicinity, favor a measure to subject the big meat packers to regulation similar to that provided by the Kenyon bill. We are opposed to the existing monopoly of meat products, cheese, etc., and we believe that this monopoly should be regulated. We understand that the Kenyon bill provides for Government regulation, but not ownership or operation; that it allows the present owners to operate their plants so long as their operations are fair, nondiscriminatory, and competitive; that it provides for the separate operation of stockyards; and that it puts private refrigeration lines on a common-carrier basis. We desire hereby to withdraw any petitions, letters, or telegrams in opposition to the Kenyon bill to which our names may have been affixed, for the reason that our former action was taken without an understanding of the contents of the bill and at the request of the packers.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Georgia memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby Okefenokee Swamp may be made a national park reservation. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, S. G. McLendon, secretary of state of the State of Georgia, do hereby certify that the matter hereto attached is a true copy of a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby the Okefenokee Swamp may be made a national park reservation, and for other purposes, approved August 18, 1919, as the same appears of file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of my office at the capitol, in the city of Atlanta, this 29th day of October, in the year of our Lord 1919 and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-fourth.

S. G. MCLENDON,
Secretary of State.

A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby the Okefenokee Swamp, in the southern section of the State of Georgia, may be made a national park reservation, and for other purposes.

Whereas the Okefenokee Swamp, located in the southern section of the State of Georgia, containing an area of about 700 square miles, in which the St. Marys River and the famous Suwanee of song and story take their source, and in which there is found so much to attract the sportsman, as its hommocks and jungles teem with wild animals and game of every description native to North America, its lakes and creeks and rivers abound in fish, and its open forests ring with the music of native bird life; and

Whereas no place in all the southeastern section of the United States offers more to the student of wild life than this swamp. Here, preserved because of its inaccessibility, remains much of the primeval life of America. No place in all the southeastern section of our country, in that vast area bounded on the north by the Potomac and Ohio Rivers and on the west by the Mississippi, contains so many different species of birds as are native to this swamp; and

Whereas here in tangled leaf and wild flower live a great many of our songsters who have escaped the destruction that awaited them elsewhere. Here, too, are some of the largest birds, going up the scale and reaching the largest eagles in this section. Here are found a few species that practically are found nowhere else; and

Whereas in this jungle also remain much of our wild game, here the bear and southern lynx can be found, the only place in this territory in which black bear exists, except in some canebrakes in isolated spots along our great rivers; and

Whereas no section is so rich in its attraction to the students as this section, and here he can reap the satisfaction of seeing many species of both bird and animal life in fairly abundant quantities that are extremely rare, if not almost extinct; and

Whereas the swamp is equally as rich for the careful student in the study of fish life; here are found a very great variety of our freshwater fish; in fact, in a narrow compass of waters are found more varieties than any other similar area. The fish that inhabit our still waters of sluggish habits here live and thrive in long lagoons and lakes. Here at many points the waters, as they meet to make the head of both the St. Marys and Suwanee Rivers, form an ideal spot for the life of some of our game fish; and

Whereas in all the Northwest and in the Southwest sections of the United States great areas have been purchased and set apart so that the people there might have a place in which to go to see the life that has disappeared forever from the plains and forests and mountains of the far West, the National Government having purchased seven great parks to carry out this work; and

Whereas here in the Southeast no friendly hand has been held out to help us in preserving for future generations the wild life that once existed in this section of the United States. Nature herself worked

hard and furnished here a natural sanctuary. Commerce has come in now and the ax of the lumberman is heard all throughout the swamps, and the coverts for game, the dense jungles in which birds and animals hide themselves from danger, will disappear unless protected, and the great forest, jungle, and swamp which form the headquarters of the two great rivers will disappear unless steps are taken to preserve same: Therefore

The House of Representatives of Georgia (the Senate concurring), do resolve:

First. That our Senators and Representatives from Georgia in Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, memorialized to have the Congress enact appropriate legislation whereby the Okefenokee Swamp may be made a national park reservation.

Second. That duly certified copies of these preambles and resolutions be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state upon the passage, approval, and filing of same in his office to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States.

JNO. N. HOLDER, *Speaker of House.*
E. B. MOORE, *Clerk of House.*
SAM L. OLIVE, *President of Senate.*
DEVEREAUX F. MCCLATCHEY,
Secretary of Senate.

Approved August 18, 1919.

HUGH M. DORSEY, *Governor.*

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I also present a resolution adopted by the State convention of the American Legion, held in Atlanta, Ga., October 15-16, 1919, urging investigation and remedial legislation in the matter of training and pay allowed disabled service men resulting from the World War. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION, GEORGIA DIVISION,
Atlanta, Ga., October 21, 1919.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is transmitted herewith a copy of resolution adopted by the State convention of the American Legion, held in Atlanta, October 15-16, 1919, urging an investigation and remedial legislation in the matter of training and pay allowed disabled service men resulting from the World War.

This is sent to you pursuant to the text of the resolution, and it is urged that you give the matter your careful consideration.

Yours, very truly,

BASIL STOCKBRIDGE,
State Chairman.

Be it resolved by the Georgia Division of the American Legion in State convention assembled, That the Congress of the United States be urged to appoint a commission to investigate the method of training disabled service men of the World War, as same is given under the present laws, and to further investigate the pay allowed to disabled service men who are taking advantage of said training, and to further investigate the compensation that is being paid to disabled men, and in case deficiencies are found as a result of said investigation that appropriate legislation be passed to remedy said deficiencies immediately; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the two Senators and to each of the Representatives from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present a resolution adopted by the State convention of the American Legion, held in Atlanta, Ga., October 15-16, 1919, urging that Congress enact a law amending the present war-risk insurance act so that premiums may be collected by post-office employees. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
GEORGIA DIVISION,
Atlanta, Ga., October 21, 1919.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is transmitted herewith copy of resolution unanimously adopted by the State convention of the American Legion, held in Atlanta on October 15-16, 1919, urging that Congress enact a law amending the present war-risk insurance act so that premiums may be collected by post-office employees.

It is urged that this matter receive your earnest consideration.

Very respectfully,

BASIL STOCKBRIDGE,
State Chairman.

Be it resolved, and it is hereby resolved, by the Georgia Division, American Legion, in convention assembled, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Georgia in the Congress of the United States be requested to introduce and urge the passage of legislation by the Congress which would authorize the receipt by postmasters and rural mail carriers of premiums upon war-risk insurance policies, it being the belief of this convention that authority to make payments of premiums upon policies to postal authorities will prevent the dropping of policies of men who are not familiar with methods of making remittance by mail.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD certain resolutions intended to operate as petitions to the Senate in behalf of the help of the American Government to the people of Armenia.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions at its annual meeting in Grand Rapids October 23, 1919.

In view of the 100 years of philanthropic service to all the people of Turkey and the large investment of life and property made by the people of America through the Christian Church; in view of the present crisis, threatening not only the continuance of this humanitarian service but the very existence of the people for whom it was established; and in view of the fact that the United States is the only one of the great powers which is in a position to render this service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That it is the earnest conviction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, assembled in Grand Rapids, Mich., that action immediately be taken by the United States to protect the people of Armenia such as is contemplated by the Williams resolution now before the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this our resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the leaders of the majority and minority parties in the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to correspond with the churches of our denomination to the end that they should urge this action upon their several representatives in the United States Senate.

On October 24 the National Council of Congregational Churches passed the same motion, substituting its name in place of that of the American board in the second paragraph and omitting the fourth paragraph.

The committee of the American board was appointed by President Edward C. Moore on October 23, as follows: President Henry C. King, Rev. James L. Barton, Mr. Franklin Warner, Rev. William Horace Day, Mr. John M. Whitehead, Rev. William E. Barton, Mr. H. M. Beardsley, Rev. Robert E. Browne, Judge John H. Perry, Mr. William E. Sweet, Rev. Ernest W. Riggs (chairman).

ARMENIAN NATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
RICHMOND BRANCH.

Resolution on behalf of Armenia.

Whereas, in spite of the fact that almost a year has passed since the signing of the armistice, the Armenian people continue to suffer, as before, all the horrors of famine, homelessness, violence, murder, persecution, exile, and imminent massacre; and Whereas thousands of Armenian women and girls are still enslaved by Kurdish, Turkish, and Arab masters; and Whereas the Armenians are now practically without means of defending themselves, while the Turks, Kurds, and Tartars are equipped with arms, and emboldened by the lax attitude of the powers, are threatening to combine in an attack upon the Armenian Republic and upon all the Armenians of Transcaucasia; and

Whereas outrageous situations of this kind have always been abhorrent to the American people; and

Whereas America entered the war for the express purpose of putting an end to them; and

Whereas there are now before the Senate two bills, one the Lodge bill, in favor of an independent Armenia, and the other, the Williams bill, referring directly to the present crisis, and recommending that we lend to Armenia some kind of military aid; and

Whereas throughout the war the Armenian people were true and valiant allies, the first and the last in the defense of the Caucasian front: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Armenian colony of Armenian National Union of America assembled in Richmond, Va., believing that to refuse aid to this heroic people at this time would be to betray the principles for which our men fought and died and to incur a lasting national dishonor, do hereby urge upon the Senate the adoption of such resolution as shall afford to the Armenian people immediate protection; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Senator LODGE, Senator HARDING, Senator WILLIAMS, Senator NEW, and to the President and Vice President.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Richmond Branch of the Armenian National Union of America on October 27, 1919.

K. DER KRIKOSIEN,
Secretary Richmond Branch of Armenian National Union of America.

We, the undersigned citizens of the city of Richmond, Va., heartily indorse the above resolutions.

[Copy of original signatures sent to President Wilson:]

George Ainslie, mayor; W. Russell Bowie, rector St. Paul's Episcopal Church; D. C. Richardson, judge; R. Carter Scott, judge; E. Randolph Williams; D. S. Freeman, editor News-Leader; James W. Morris, rector Monumental Episcopal Church; E. Raleigh Phillips; Alex. Ryland; Wm. C. Camp, American National Bank; City officials: Geo. Wayne Anderson, W. M. Winston, R. L. Hasker, W. R. McLaughlin, R. W. White, J. F. Waller, Thos. M. Landers, sr., S. M. Baughan, C. E. Hayward, Marie C. Daly, Hattie C. Crist, Celute J. Barrow, Mattie E. Campbell, Winifred P. Moxon, E. G. Friend, Bessie E. Irving, Gay B. Shepperson, Alice E. Hopkins, Abe Cohn, C. Upsher Creery, S. C. Hardin, J. E. Burnett, Beverley T. Crump, L. L. Cheatwood, Wm. Reinhard, A. Van Buren, J. H. Lawder, Geo. W. Libby, J. R. Perdue, jr., G. H. Tompkins, Louis C. Gissler, H. E. Treson, W. L. Tyler, Cleat Walke, Stuart Bowe, Wm. H. Wyatt, jr., W. J. Griggs, C. M. Smith, Jr., H. C. Cofer, Chas. I. Phillips, Luther Libby, Thos. Haddon, William E. Smith, J. Geter Jones, Merchants Bank; Government officials: Walter D. Melton, Harry Wood, Chas. B. Reid, W. A. Grant, Claude A. Hess, Howard L. Melton, John W. Arnold, Harrison S. Hall, A. D. Fenson, R. J. Rowlett, Vara H. Winston, R. Lew Phillips, Douglas Baird, Elmo S. Redwood, Ed. E. Bernard, F. W. Kenner, Walter S. Doughty, J. Harrison Tabb, William R. Vial, jr., W. B. Allen, W. T. Miles, G. Gordon Brown.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD certain resolutions from the Council of Jewish Women in favor of the unqualified ratification of the treaty of peace and the league of nations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK SECTION,
COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN,
October 23, 1919.

Senator JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At a large open meeting of the New York section of the Council of Jewish Women, held on October 23, 1919, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas the league of nations presents the only hope of universal and lasting peace and of ultimate disarmament; and
"Whereas the league of nations would establish peace on the high moral plane of justice and freedom to weak nations as well as to strong; and
"Whereas the safety and liberty of our country are in every way protected by this covenant; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New York Section of the Council of Jewish Women, consisting of 3,600 citizens, in meeting assembled, indorse the covenant of the league of nations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to every member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and to each of the Senators from New York State."

Very truly, yours,

Mrs. IRVING LEHMAN,
Chairman Committee on Legislation.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of Thomas Francis Meagher Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Anaconda, Mont., remonstrating against the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Arlington Women's Union Club, of Bangor, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 2743, United Mine Workers of America, of Ringo, Kans., favoring the wage demands of miners in the pending coal strike and expressing their loyalty to the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 411) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of fact, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 1233) to repeal an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," and the act amendatory thereof, reported adversely thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3090) to repeal the espionage act, reported adversely thereon.

SUGAR SHORTAGE.

Mr. McNARY. On behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report back favorably the bill (S. 3284) to provide for the national welfare by continuing the United States Sugar Equalization Board until December 31, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 286) thereon.

Mr. RANSDELL. I ask for 24 hours in which to prepare and file the views of the minority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted. The bill reported by the Senator from Oregon will be placed on the calendar.

MINNESOTA RIVER DAM.

Mr. NELSON. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3263) to authorize the construction of flood control and improvement works in Minnesota River and Big Stone Lake between the States of Minnesota and South Dakota, and I submit a report (No. 284) thereon. The bill is recommended by the department. It gives consent to the local authorities to erect a dam. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota if North Dakota is not included?

Mr. NELSON. It will be included, I suppose, ultimately in the waterworks. This is for a dam at the foot of Big Stone Lake, between Minnesota and South Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the bill may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Minnesota Valley Drainage and Flood Control District, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, and the Big Stone Lake Drainage and Flood Control District, organized and existing under the laws of the State of South Dakota, are

hereby authorized to construct a dam across Minnesota River at the foot of Big Stone Lake, together with such dikes, spillways, diversion channels, and other works in said river and lake as the said districts may agree upon as necessary for the prevention and control of floods, the improvement of navigation, and the drainage of land: *Provided*, That plans for the works hereby authorized shall be submitted to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers for their approval, and unless and until approved by them no part of the said works shall be built or commenced.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOWN-SITE ALLOTMENTS IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. SPENCER. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 7751) authorizing the sale of inherited and unpartitioned allotments for town-site purposes in the Quapaw Agency, Okla., and I submit a report (No. 285) thereon.

Mr. OWEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It relates merely to the drainage of a very small section in the Ottawa country where a town has been built up in the zinc fields. It is purely a local matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read before consent is given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, upon the application heretofore or hereafter made, of a majority in interest of the owners of any inherited and unpartitioned allotment in the Quapaw Agency, Okla., to sell the surface of said allotted lands, in whole or in part, for town-site purposes, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, concerning terms of sale and disposal of the proceeds for the benefit of the respective Indians: *Provided*, That any duly authorized representative of the Interior Department may execute any deed or other instrument necessary to the completion of such sale in the name and on behalf of any of the owners of said land if such owner or his legal representative shall fail or refuse to execute such deed or other instrument for a period of 30 days after being given notice in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe that such deed or other instrument is ready for execution.

In conducting such sale the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, prescribe such conditions and requirements as may be necessary for the protection of any person or persons he may find to have legal or equitable interests in any of said lands or the improvements thereon, making due allowance, in his discretion, for the value of such improvements, but no preference right to purchase any lot or tract shall be accorded any person for a period exceeding 90 days.

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, to cover the expense of conducting such sale, such sum to be reimbursed to the Treasury out of the proceeds of the sale and to be apportioned among the distributees of the fund derived from the sale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3357) to provide funds for continuing work upon existing projects already authorized by the act of June 17, 1902, and subsequent acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, known as the reclamation law; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 3358) fixing the ages for appointment of officers who have served in the Reserve Corps during the war with the Imperial German Empire to a relative rank in the Regular Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3359) to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3360) granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3361) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda C. Doney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3362) for the relief of the Jefferson Lime Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3363) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCE:

A bill (S. 3364) to provide increased compensation for employees of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 3365) for the relief of Hilbert A. C. Jensen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 3366) granting a pension to Harry B. Robb; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 3367) for the erection of a public building in the city of Stillwater, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3368) to provide for aeroplane mail service between New York City, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) making November 11 of each year a national holiday, to be known as Liberty Thanksgiving Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not usually take very much time in the morning hour, but I ask unanimous consent of the Senate at this time for about 15 or 20 minutes to submit some remarks with reference to a bill which I propose to introduce relating to shipping.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Washington will proceed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, when the World War began we had 1,076,152 gross tons of shipping out of nearly 50,000,000 tons engaged in the world's trade. It was carrying only about 10 per cent of our foreign commerce. Then was brought home to us the need of a great nation for a merchant marine. Foreign shipping upon which we were dependent was taken for war purposes. Our products and goods could not be exported for lack of ships. Charter rates became excessive, many of our industries were prostrate, and our people were threatened with ruin. The loss actually suffered was more than would have been required to secure an adequate merchant marine under proper governmental encouragement.

When we entered the war in 1917 our foreign tonnage had increased to 2,191,715 tons under the impetus of war needs. Then it was that our protective coastwise policy was fully justified. It is safe to say that the war was really won by our coastwise merchant marine, which then amounted to 6,277,934 tons. Many of the best ships available for transporting troops, munitions, and supplies were coastwise ships which we would not have had except for the policy followed for the protection of our coastwise shipping from foreign competition. It saved us and the Allies from defeat, or helped us to an early victory.

As it was, our power was greatly impaired by the lack of ships. Men and supplies were to be taken over water thousands of miles. Ships had to be secured at any cost or militarism would be triumphant, our flag dishonored, and liberty lost to the world for generations. Over three billions of dollars were appropriated by Congress for ships. This is more than the book value of all the merchant ships of the world in 1914 and a heavy price to pay for the neglect of years.

No one knew how long the war would last. A shipbuilding program for a two or more years' war was begun and carried on until victory came. After the armistice many contracts were canceled, and the program will likely be completed by December 31, 1920. By the end of next year we will have, including our coastwise shipping, a merchant fleet of almost 18,000,000 gross tons, and about equal to that of the British Empire.

We do not desire, and it is not our purpose, to drive other nations off the sea, but we do want to do, and we ought to do, at least our proportionate part of our own and the world's carrying trade, so that our commerce shall have a fair chance in the world's markets, and that we may be hereafter fully prepared for any emergency that may confront us. In my judgment, the people are ready to do anything needed to bring this about.

Our ships have been built in a hurry. Many are not the best for our trade. We have too many of some kinds and none of others. The fleet should be properly balanced and then we should maintain it on a par with commercial growth and keep it up to the highest state of efficiency. If any nation seeks to drive us off the sea, we should meet such an attempt with all our resources. If our right to have and operate a merchant marine commensurate with our wealth, commerce, and power is admitted by other nations, it will be well for them and for us. The need of the British Empire of a great merchant marine is admitted by

us; but it is not good that the world should depend upon one nation for its water transportation. The world's peace is not safe or assured under such a condition. We are the greatest exporting Nation in the world, and the second, if not the first, importing Nation, and we should be no more dependent upon foreign transportation to get our products to market than should any other nation.

Of the 12,000,000 tons of shipping for the foreign trade that will be under our flag by the close of next year, more than 8,000,000 will be owned by the Government and paid for by taxes from the people. What to do with it and how to use it is the problem that confronts us, and it should be solved as soon as possible.

We may differ about Government ownership, but that can be no issue here. The Government owns these ships, whether we will or no. They can not be given away. The people will not stand for that. We must not allow private parties to take the cream of this shipping and let the Government hold the balance to dispose of at a great sacrifice. Grant that Government ownership should end as soon as may be; it must be brought about as nearly as may be without unnecessary sacrifice and just as a private individual would get rid of property he did not desire to keep but that he did not have to dispose of at a sacrifice. Furthermore, the Government is interested in the future success of shipping and the maintenance of a permanent fleet. That object must be kept in view, and in getting rid of Government ownership we must try not to sacrifice our property and must strive also to build up and put our shipping on a permanent basis. In fact, the ultimate purpose of our legislation should be the establishment of a policy under which an adequate merchant marine will be developed and maintained under private ownership and operation.

Private interest, incentive, and energy bring the greatest efficiency. Efficiency means success—its absence, failure—in business and enterprise. When any of these ships can be sold so as to promote the ultimate purpose they should be sold. If not sold, they should be operated privately when this can be arranged for on fair terms and in a way to promote the ultimate purpose.

No one can reasonably hope that private enterprise and capital, in the face of foreign competition and handicapped by our own inexperience and lack of business connections and facilities, will be able to absorb and take over all this shipping in a short while and establish the routes we ought to have. To serve our present needs, establish and maintain new lines, and develop the new markets that we must have if our merchant marine is to be what it ought to be, additional ships of special type, size, and speed must be built. They will cost large sums of money. Some may be built by private capital, but in my judgment most of them will have to be built by the Government if we are to have them. They can be built without new appropriations and as a part of a policy that will not only cost the Government nothing but will help repay what has already been spent. Along with the ships we have we also have agencies to build the ships we need. It is economy to use them, even if the additional cost of a ship may be a little more—which I very much doubt. At Camden, N. J., for example, the Government has a plant for the building of the largest ships in the world with ways a thousand feet long. This plant has cost several millions of dollars, and for all practical purposes is a part of the New York Shipbuilding Co.'s yard. Unless private shipbuilding interests are ready to buy it and pay a fair price for it, the Government ought to keep it and through the New York Shipbuilding Co. construct the ships that it ought to have and for the construction of which there are probably no other existing facilities.

The situation that confronts us is about this: We are comparatively inexperienced in financing, building, and operating ships. We ought to have, for national safety and commercial success, at least 15,000,000 tons of shipping, to be maintained and increased as our trade grows, along with ample shipbuilding and repair yards. We will have this shipping by the close of 1920, with 8,000,000 tons or more of it owned by the Government. What shall we do to bring it ultimately into private hands, insure its maintenance and development to meet the needs of national safety and commerce, and at the same time return to the people the greatest part of their investment?

After consulting with men of experience, who in the suggestions they have made I believe have subordinated their personal interests to the public welfare, I have prepared a bill which I believe can be made to form the basis of such a policy. It coordinates private initiative, incentive, and patriotism with governmental power and responsibility, and, I hope, may accomplish the great purpose sought by all.

Many point out the need of a policy to do what we want done, but few, if any, suggest concrete plans. The Saturday Evening Post of October 18 points out the relative development of ship-

ping since 1914, showing that while the British fleet is smaller by 5,000,000 tons than it would have been if no war had occurred and the German fleet smaller by three and a half millions tons, the American fleet is larger by more than 7,000,000 tons. It goes on to say:

The figures graphically illustrate our enormous relative advance in the shipping field, and ships can now be built in this country cheaper than in England—perhaps cheaper than in Germany.

But neither England nor Germany is overmuch discouraged by that condition. Both of them admit that we have taken a colossal stride in incredibly short time and that at the moment they are handicapped. They say, also, that of old they beat us hollow at shipbuilding and ship operating, and they cherish a notion that under normal conditions they can finally beat us again. They say that building ships in short order under Government fiat is one thing, while operating those ships year in and year out against the competition of the shrewdest, most experienced shipping men and nations of the world is another thing.

And they are largely correct in that contention, and that is one of the conditions that we must take into account in trying to solve this problem.

They rather expect us to make enough mistakes to put the game back into their hands again. They are not without good grounds for their expectation. A full half century of mistaken and ill-considered national policy in respect of American shipping brought it to the pass in which the European war found it in 1914. A new and comprehensive code of shipping laws, buttressed by a sound and far-seeing policy in maritime matters, is the only thing which can prevent our competitors' wishes from coming true.

Everybody agrees that we are to have intensive competition and that we need a sound and far-reaching policy to maintain our proper position, and all the writers on this subject would give more substantial aid by trying to develop such a policy rather than to spend so much time in demonstrating what we all know.

The plan I propose is a concrete one. It has its defects and its dangers. Graft, waste, and extravagance are possible under it; but before it is condemned let some one suggest a plan that will not permit these things. The ships and property we have must be handled and controlled by human agencies with more or less discretion, and as long as this must be so these things can not be wholly avoided. Let those who criticize and condemn this plan suggest something better. Let us construe rather than destroy. Anything better and safer will be welcomed by me. An adequate merchant marine, built in American shipyards by American labor, owned by American capital, operated and manned by American seamen, carrying American commerce to all the ports of the world, and flying the American flag, has been my dream for many years, and it is my purpose to do whatever I can to attain this great end, and I will support any measure and any policy that will give a reasonable assurance of accomplishing this great object.

What I suggest is, in fact, not new. We now have the United States Shipping Board acting in a dual capacity. It was intended to be a great regulatory, governmental agency, and is in fact doing the work of a great corporation. It can not well serve both ends. I do not propose to destroy the Shipping Board. What I propose is to divorce it entirely from building, selling, or operating ships and allow it to do the things it was primarily created to do, and establish a corporation separate and independent of it to operate, maintain, and dispose of our ships in such a way as to give us an adequate merchant marine on a permanent basis. We need an agency that can act promptly and do whatever the emergency or situation demands. The best governmental agencies of this war have been the corporations created to serve particular needs. They have done their work well and with profit to the Government, and have shown that corporate agencies can be used as effectively in governmental activities as in private enterprises.

The first section of this bill declares it to be the policy of the United States to have a merchant marine sufficient to insure our safety in time of emergency, so far as merchant ships can do so, and also sufficient to carry the greater part of our commerce, together with ample shipbuilding and repair plants, all ultimately to be owned and operated by private parties and capital.

Section 2 creates a corporation entirely separate and distinct from the Shipping Board, with nine directors to be appointed by the President from the different sections of the country for a term of eight years. This corporation continues for 30 years unless otherwise provided by law, and has all the powers of a private corporation for the accomplishment of the purposes of its creation. It has no capital stock, but there is transferred to it all the ships of the United States acquired as a result of the war and all the ships, shipyards, property, and assets of the United States Shipping Board and the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation, which shall constitute its capital. It is authorized to use this capital in any way that it deems best to accomplish the purposes of the act. All the contracts and liabilities of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation will be taken

over by it. It is authorized and empowered "to construct, equip, repair, maintain, operate, sell, lease, charter, exchange, or otherwise dispose of vessels of the United States, and issue and deal in maritime securities, make contracts, acquire, hold, and dispose of such other property, both real and personal, as may be necessary and convenient for corporate purposes, and to establish and maintain, within and without the United States, port, terminal, and warehouse facilities and coal or oil bunkers or stations for use in connection with our merchant marine, and to do any and all things deemed by it necessary to develop an adequate American merchant marine composed of ships of suitable types, speed," and so forth. In brief, it is proposed to place in the control of this corporation, whose directors are men of the highest standing and largest business experience, ships, shipyards, and assets which cost about \$3,000,000,000, for the purpose of accomplishing a definite, declared object, and give them full authority to do with these assets a certain and definite thing. Our biggest men will welcome the opportunity to do this great thing. They can do it if it can be done, and I do not doubt that they will do it.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for the transfer to the corporation of the property and assets to be handled by it.

Section 5 extends the coastwise laws to the Sandwich Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Philippines after six months from the passage of the act and directs the corporation to see that adequate service is maintained between the United States and these islands. This will doubtless soon develop a large commerce with these islands and result in private capital taking over any steamship lines the corporation may have to establish and extending them to China and Japan.

Section 6 prohibits competition by the corporation with established American shipping lines.

Section 7 makes the ships of this corporation subject to all the laws of the United States the same as private ships.

Section 8 provides for annual reports.

Section 9 authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Shipping Board to require connection between rail and water carriers, and authorizes these bodies to establish through export rates over rail and water lines to encourage, develop, and increase our commerce.

Section 10 makes it the duty of the Shipping Board to investigate and advise the corporation what steamship lines and postal service should be established and maintained between the ports of the United States and other world ports, together with an estimate of the cost of such postal service, and the type, size, speed, and other requirements of ships, and the corporation is authorized to establish such service as speedily as possible, although the discretion of doing so is left entirely with the corporation.

Section 11 requires the corporation to determine the need for ships between the terminal of the Government railroad in Alaska and other ports, and furnish suitable service for the same unless it can be done by private parties.

Section 12 establishes the principal place of business of the corporation at Philadelphia.

Section 13 repeals the emergency acts under which the present fleet of ships has been constructed, and makes unexpended appropriations available for the work of the corporation.

Section 14 repeals sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Shipping Board act, which authorized the construction, operation, and so forth, of ships.

Section 15 repeals certain acts relating to the coastwise and other emergency legislation.

Section 16 contains the common provision with respect to the effect of declaring unconstitutional any part of the act, and also declares that the specific enumeration of powers shall not exclude other powers embraced within general terms.

Section 17 directs the President to take steps to abrogate the provisions of treaties of commerce that restrict our right to impose discriminating duties on imports.

It may be said that this is a great power and responsibility to put in the hands of a few men. It is; but we have a great property to be handled and a great object to be attained. It must be done in a great way if it is to be done at all.

Mr. President, the committee has not taken up this matter as yet, because we have been waiting for a disposition of the peace treaty. Many of the members of the committee have been working on very important legislation before other committees, including railroad legislation and the peace treaty, so that we have not thought it well to start hearings. I have prepared bills from investigations that I have made as expressive of the views I have reached myself and not as giving the views of the committee in order that concrete propositions may be before the committee as a basis for the hearings which we hope

to begin soon. As I say, the bill to which I have specially referred is prepared without any purpose of doing away with the Shipping Board, and it leaves the Shipping Board to do exactly what it was primarily intended to do.

I have also prepared another bill expressing the views I have on the theory of the Shipping Board handling the ships; and if that should be the policy that should be adopted by the committee after the hearings, then I think these suggestions will be of benefit. These concrete measures will probably aid the committee in getting more prompt action after the committee has had its hearings upon this matter, which I consider really as important a problem as we have before this Congress. I consider it a problem even more difficult of solution than the railroad problem, because we have the experience which no other nation has with reference to the railroad problem, while we are lacking in experience in the shipping problem, and this with the very nature of shipping operations and conditions makes it very difficult to work out.

Mr. President, I present these two bills and I ask that they may be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 3355) to provide for the disposition or operation of merchant vessels of the United States, to stimulate interstate and foreign commerce, to encourage the development of the merchant marine of the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 3356) to create the United States Merchant Marine Corporation and to sustain and build up the merchant marine of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Washington has introduced the bills and explained his purpose; and, to some extent, the plan of the bills. I agree with him that there is no more important subject with which Congress has to deal than this question of taking proper care of the American merchant marine. We are in a position now where we can hold our place, a self-respecting and decent and proper place, on the oceans of the world. I hope the time never will come when the United States will again be a beggar of ships.

Just what may be determined with reference to these bills, I think, will depend somewhat on what is developed before the committee. I take it the chairman will arrange for hearings on the bills, so that we may have the views of all those who are thoroughly acquainted with the problem. It is quite clear in my mind that we ought at least to continue the operation of ships by the Government, either through some corporation or through the Shipping Board, for a period of 5 or 10 years, or until such time as new trade routes are thoroughly established. However, that, no doubt, will be developed upon the hearings on these bills.

Recently I received some very well considered and clear views on this subject from a gentleman who has given it considerable thought, Mr. R. L. McKellar, and I ask that these views may be inserted in the RECORD. I do not know that I care to have them read, unless some other Senator does. These will go along with the observations of the Senator from Washington.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN RAILROAD LINES,
Washington, D. C., October 18, 1919.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Operation of the American merchant marine.

DEAR SENATOR: Recalling your talk on the above subject to the Shipping Board men at the Elks Club on Friday afternoon of last week, at which time you invited an expression of individual views.

In response to this invitation, I wish to say that many will agree with you that governmental operation of railroads is undesirable, principally because the roads are owned privately and the Government is under obligations to return them to their owners within a reasonable period after the close of the war.

However, when it comes to the operation of our rapidly increasing merchant marine, it is a different proposition, for the following reasons: First. It is owned by the Government, is essential to world commerce, and is a necessary adjunct to our Navy.

Second. An organization for its operation has been created and is in process of development in accordance with existing needs.

Third. If this organization is continued and stabilized, both in its operation and traffic branches, and expanded to meet the requirements of competition and the increasing outturn of newly constructed vessels, it will mean that our ocean service heretofore so largely concentrated on a few ports will be spread out, and that all of our usable ports on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific will be supplied with steamship service and new trade routes will be opened up to all ports of the world offering trade with this country.

Fourth. Under Government ownership and operation, these new trade routes can be served and continued until a remunerative business is developed or at least until it is fully demonstrated that the need for such service does not exist.

Fifth. If new construction is stopped and sale of vessels now owned by the Shipping Board is made to private enterprise, it means that under private ownership and operation the larger ports and the best

paying trade routes will, as a matter of course, be given preference and that the establishment of new and remunerative trade routes will be a matter of long-deferred and long-drawn-out development, and in some instances only as the result of an overproduction of shipping and consequent remote necessity for finding additional markets in order to employ such excess shipping.

Sixth. It is even possible that under private ownership and operation that vessels now operated and allotted to new service, as in the case of the newly established service from south Atlantic and Gulf ports, will be withdrawn and put into better paying routes if the present routes are not found immediately remunerative.

Seventh. Competition on the Pacific Ocean is also a matter of vital importance to the permanent establishment of our merchant marine in all directions, and it is extremely doubtful if private enterprise will meet that competition as quickly as will the United States Shipping Board under a well-defined policy of continued and stabilized operation.

Eighth. It is my belief that the United States Government should continue without interruption its shipbuilding program, covering vessels suitable for commercial use, including passenger vessels and colliers for transporting commercial coal, and that Government operation should be continued until our merchant marine is firmly established upon the high seas in the handling of the ocean commerce of the world.

It is my further belief that under stabilized and aggressive governmental operation, coordinated with competitive railroad operation, that our merchant marine will do as much in 5 years toward developing our foreign commerce through all ports as will be done in 25 years if the Shipping Board's building program is arrested and ships now owned are sold to private enterprise and no provision made for absorbing the loss in establishing new trade routes and in regular service from ports heretofore inadequately served.

Canada's merchant-marine policy, as indicated in the following extract from Shipping, is also of interest in its relation to ours:

[Magazine, Shipping, Sept. 27, 1919.]

"The Canadian Government has decided to inaugurate an active shipping policy in conjunction with its railroads. Following the lines developed by the Australian, South African, and other governments, it will operate freight and passenger ships on all the seas in the interest of Canadian commerce.

"The Canadian Government maritime transportation service will be operated by the Canadian national railway board. Next month the board expects to place about 30 vessels in commission, and new vessels will be added as fast as the builders can deliver them. The initial service will start from Halifax and St. John and will include Newfoundland, Liverpool, Glasgow, London, Avonmouth, Kingston, Habana and other West Indian ports, Buenos Aires, and possibly Cape Town.

"An Australian and New Zealand service will be run monthly from Vancouver. The Canadian *Raider*, a 5,100-ton vessel, will shortly be placed on this route. Other vessels for Pacific services to the Orient and India are being built in British Columbia yards and will be commissioned as rapidly as conditions permit. Many of these ships are expected to be on their station before the end of December.

"When the scheme is rounded out the Government of Canada will possess vessels making regular commercial voyages on all the important sea routes of the world. They will be operated solely in the interest of the Canadian people and in cooperation with the Canadian Government railroads, consular and commercial-intelligence service."

Yours, very truly,

R. L. MCKELLAR.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am heartily in sympathy with the bill which the Senator from Washington has just submitted to the Senate. There is, however, another viewpoint of the shipping situation which we must consider in connection with any program, however unimportant. I refer to the boycott of ships which have been completed for the Shipping Board, which belong to the United States, and which may be the precursor of many similar proceedings by some of the affiliated unions of this country. If the resolution which I shall send to the desk in a moment and ask to have read is a fair test of what is coming, we must prepare to overcome them, else we may build our vessels in the hope of restoring the merchant marine of the United States, but the only practical effect will be to make them "painted ships upon a painted ocean."

I ask unanimous consent for the reading of the resolution to which I refer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WATERFRONT WORKERS' FEDERATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST,
San Francisco, Calif., September 4, 1919.

TO SHIPOWNERS, SHIPPERS, CHARTERERS, AND OTHERS CONCERNED:

Herewith find copy of resolution adopted by the Federation on the 3d instant relative to the strike of shipyard workers' unions at Los Angeles against the Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.:

"Whereas it is the declared object of the Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., backed by the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, to disrupt and destroy the organizations of labor in the shipbuilding industry in Los Angeles; and

"Whereas this attitude on the part of the employing interests is a threat and challenge to organized labor everywhere: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Waterfront Workers' Federation this 3d day of September, 1919, That the members of its affiliated unions will not sail in, handle cargo from or to, or do any overhauling or repairs to steamship *West Calumet* or any other vessel completed by the Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. since the strike of the shipyard workers against that establishment until such time as a satisfactory settlement of the dispute is effected; further

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to cooperate with the Iron Trades Council of San Francisco, with a view to making this resolution effective; and further

"Resolved, That the Secretary notify all shipowners, shippers, and charterers, and other employers concerned of this action on the part of the federation."

Respectfully,

DON CAMERON, President.
E. ELLISON, Secretary.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has called that resolution to the attention of the Senate. It seems, however, to be a part of a nation-wide program affecting all lines of industry. There is in the bill which I introduced one section to which I did not refer, and that is a provision looking toward the training of American citizens for officers of ships and American seamen to man these ships. If this is carried out and succeeds, as we hope it will, I do not think we will have nearly so much trouble along those lines.

CONTROL OF RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration the conference report on the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, submitted by me on Friday last.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the conference report on, Mr. President?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is on the bill to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission its former jurisdiction with regard to rates and charges for transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. KING. I offer a resolution of ratification and ask that it may be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The resolution of ratification was read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace signed at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and other belligerent powers, with this reservation:

That whereas the Government of the United States takes the view that it is entirely competent through the legislative powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution and the inherent legislative powers of the several States of the Union to deal with all questions of domestic policy, and especially with all questions concerning the status and relations of labor; and

Whereas article 19 of the convention of the league of nations, which is a part of said treaty, provides that the assembly of the league of nations may from time to time advise the consideration by members of the league of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world, under which power the assembly of the league of nations is entirely competent to deal with such conditions of labor as may produce unrest so great as that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled, but notwithstanding said provision said treaty of peace further provides a special international organization of labor which is extraneous to the league of nations, the powers of which are defined in Part XIII of the treaty, comprising articles 387 to 427, inclusive; and

Whereas the Government of the United States does not recognize that the intervention of such said international labor office is at all necessary for the adoption of humane conditions of labor or would promote the cause of labor within the United States, or that such intervention would in any wise be proper or permissible: Therefore

The United States of America withholds its assent to Part XIII, comprising articles 387 to 427, inclusive, of the said treaty of peace, and excepts and reserves the same from the act of ratification; and the United States of America declines to participate in any way in the said general conference or to participate in the election of the governing body of the international labor office constituted by said article, and declines in any way to contribute or be bound to contribute to the expenditures of said general conference or international labor office.

THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record a newspaper article, together with copies of cablegrams from Egypt, protesting against the use of machine guns by the British to suppress peaceful demonstrations for national self-determination. I also ask that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TWO RIOTERS ARE SLAIN IN ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT—TWENTY-SEVEN POLICEMEN AND TEN CIVILIANS INJURED AS RESULT OF NATIONALIST DEMONSTRATION.

ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT, October 25.

Two rioters were killed and 10 others injured and 27 policemen were hurt in a serious nationalist demonstration yesterday. The trouble arose when the police attempted to suppress a peaceable demonstration, such as have recently been a weekly feature of political activity in Alexandria. Sticks, stones, bottles, and police batons first were used. The arrival of the governor of Alexandria restored order for a time. Then two motor lorries with troops appeared on the scene, and eventually shots were fired at the crowd.

To-day there was some recurrence of the trouble at the harbor side, but it was of a comparative minor character.

CAIRO, EGYPT, October 25.

Shouts of "We don't want the Milner Commission!" interrupted a band playing "God save the King" at the public gardens yesterday, giving the signal for a nationalist demonstration. The trouble was quelled by the authorities, who placed a number of students under arrest.

[Cablegrams received from Egypt protesting against use of machine guns by the British to suppress peaceful demonstrations for national self-determination:]

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

Egyptians in expressing their political feelings by peaceful demonstration were met with machine guns. In the name of miserable Egypt we protest against such hellish cruelty in the twentieth century.

STUDENTS NASRICH TRAINING COLLEGE.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

To free Americans protest against shooting by English troops unarmed peaceful demonstrators Alexandria, 24th instant, who asked independence and protested against Milner mission.

ENGINEERING STUDENTS.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

Protest to Americans crimes committed by English against Alexandria manifestants.

AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL MOUSSTOHER.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

To free Americans we protest against British troops shooting unarmed peaceful demonstrators, children, women, men in Alexandria.

EGYPTIAN MEDICAL STUDENTS.

TANTA, October 29, 1919.

On strike and protest ferocity of English troops at Alexandria.

NIZAMIA COLLEGE, TANTA.

TANTA, October 29, 1919.

The Egyptian lives are at stake. We protest against the British force who shot the peaceful manifestants yesterday at Alexandria.

TANTA STUDENTS.

ALEXANDRIA, October 29, 1919.

We protest against English shooting Alexandria natives on 24th and 25th instant.

KAMILIA COLLEGE.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

English military bloodshed recommenced against unarmed peaceful innocent demonstrators in Alexandria; complaints to liberal Americans.

KHEDIVIAN STUDENTS.

ALEXANDRIA, October 29, 1919.

Before American Nation we protest against the atrocities committed by the British soldiers against the unarmed demonstrators in Alexandria.

ALEXANDRIA GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

British troops fixed unarmed peaceful demonstrators in Alexandria 24th. Protest before free Americans.

TEWFIKIEH SCHOOL.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

Students of intermediate school commence strongly protest against abominable atrocities committed in Alexandria yesterday by British troops against unarmed populace.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

At the moment when universal peace is reigning everywhere England attempts to strangle peaceable demonstrations by the most brutal force. The principles of the American people are opposed to such inhuman massacre of the weak.

STUDENTS OF ELAZHAR UNIVERSITY.

SHEBINELKOM, October 29, 1919.

We protest energetically against the massacre of peaceable protestants.

STUDENTS OF MASSAI ELMASHKOURA COLLEGE.

DESSOUK, October 31, 1919.

We protest energetically against the British troops who use freely their arms against the inhabitants of Alexandria, and we request American sympathy.

THE INHABITANTS OF DESSOUK, EGYPT.

CAIRO, October 31, 1919.

English forces have begun atrocities and savage rage against unarmed civilians at Alexandria. Women and children were killed. We protest.

WADINIL SCHOOL.

CAIRO, October 31, 1919.

Regret report British troops resumed shooting defenseless women, children, men demonstrating peacefully Alexandria.

COPTIC SCHOOL STUDENTS
(Christian School).

CAIRO, October 31, 1919.

We appreciate efforts American Nation to save us from British imperialism. Confident efforts will continue for humanity's sake until aim attained. Twenty-fourth instant 81 women and children shot or wounded, Alexandria. Please acknowledge.

OFFICIALS OF THE SULTANIC AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

ALEXANDRIA, October 30, 1919.

The Egyptians are being prevented from making peaceful demonstrations by British machine guns. In the name of unhappy Egyptian people we protest against such barbarism committed in the twentieth century.

INHABITANTS OF GABRARI, ALEXANDRIA.

DELLA JAMES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that we begin with Calendar No. 201, Senate joint resolution 51, as the preceding bills have been passed over.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; we were on Calendar No. 200, House bill 3844, at the time when we last considered the calendar, and had not disposed of that bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is true that that bill was under consideration at the time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we should conclude Calendar No. 200 before we go to No. 201.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will ask that the order be changed so as to begin with Calendar No. 200.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3844) for the relief of Della James, the pending question being on the amendment of the Committee on Claims, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "\$60" and insert "\$57.50," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Della James, of Richmond County, Ga., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for herself and in behalf of her children, the sum of \$57.50 per month for a period of 10 years, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss by death of her husband, Alfred J. James, through the explosion of a certain shell used in target practice by the One hundred and seventh Field Artillery, Fifty-third Artillery Brigade, Twenty-eighth Division, at Camp Hancock, near Augusta, Ga., on March 29, 1918, said compensation to be payable from and after March 29, 1918: Provided, That the said money shall be applied to the support of the widow and the said children during their respective minorities, but if she again marries the entire amount thereafter shall be used by her for the benefit of the minor children, and if the mother dies the money shall be paid the oldest child for the minors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know that I can add anything to what I said when this bill was up for consideration more than a week ago. I doubt the wisdom of such legislation. I think it would be very much better to follow the practice of the Senate in the past, and pay Della James on the same basis on which other beneficiaries are paid where death has occurred to an employee of the Government. I can not see why the family of a person not in the employ of the Government should receive more compensation on account of an accident than the family of a person employed by the Government. This is a new form of legislation. But if the Senate desires to agree to this bill, adopt this policy, and create a precedent of this character, well and good.

I have no doubt but what sympathy plays a great part in this case, as it does in almost all such cases; but I want the Senate to know what it will lead to in the future. There is not a widow of a soldier of the Civil War, old as they may be, helpless as they are, who is receiving any such amount, with the exception of about 125 widows of officers who served in the Civil War.

I know, Mr. President, it is claimed that the amount that was granted to those widows was granted at a time when the cost of living was a great deal less than it is to-day, and I recognize that fact; but if we are going to take up individual cases and pass bills based upon the sympathy which, of course, every man must have in just such a case, how are we going to escape treating in the same way the hundreds of thousands who are in just as serious a condition, perhaps, as this one widow?

I look at it as being a broader question than this one particular case, and I want to do what I think is my duty by calling attention to what it will lead to in the future if we treat all alike. I would very much prefer, Mr. President, to have the bill amended so as to conform to the practice of the Senate in the past.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What would the widow receive under the regular law or precedent?

Mr. SMOOT. If it were the case of a Government employee?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; a Government employee.

Mr. SMOOT. It would be whatever the person killed had been receiving by way of compensation for one year.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, unlike the Senator from Utah, I think I can add a little something to what I said with reference to this same bill when it was up for discussion a week or two ago, and it will be in the way of further answer to the question which has just been put by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

In the first place, I want to have it understood that the man who was killed was not an employee of the Government at all.

He was a farmer, who lived on his little place, which was in the vicinity of the target range run in connection with Fort Hancock, Ga. The target range had been laid out with reference to the presence of the farms of this man and of others like him. A shell fired on the target range killed him on his own place, as he was at work in his own field.

A board of Army officers was convened and made a very thorough investigation of the case and reported that the accident was due entirely to the negligence of the officers who fired the shot, and laid the blame for the death of the man entirely upon those officers. The man left a widow and nine children, the oldest of whom was then 16 years of age, and the ages ranged from that down almost to infants in arms; they were very young children.

The Senator from Utah says that had the man been an employee of the Government his widow would have been entitled to one year's salary. The fact is that had the man been in the employ of the Government, under the Federal compensation act his widow would have received two-thirds of the amount of which her husband was in annual receipt and \$10 a month on account of each child. So had that principle been applied she would have been receiving very much more than is provided in the bill; she would have been in receipt of \$80 a month on account of the children.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator is wrong in stating my position. The Senator is discussing the question as though the man were in the Army and lost his life while in the Army, and his widow would receive compensation under the act dealing with soldiers. I had reference to a civilian who is employed by the Government, and this man being a civilian, I compared the two cases and pointed out the distinction.

Mr. NEW. What I stated is what his widow would have received had he been a civilian employee of the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken in that.

Mr. NEW. I think not.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure that the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. NEW. I will refer the Senator to the Federal compensation act approved September 7, 1916, chapter 458, volume 39, United States Statutes at Large, sections (a) and (c).

Mr. SMOOT. Does not that act have reference to the war with Germany?

Mr. NEW. Not at all. But, Mr. President, the Senator speaks of what would have been the case had the man been a soldier. Of course, this man was not a soldier. There is no possible theory of law or justice under which he, a man with nine children, could have been taken as a soldier. Of course, he was exempt under the conscription act. He would not have been taken as a soldier except in case of the very direst extremity, when the last man in the country would have been required.

The report that I filed in favor of the allowance of this relief is not based upon any sympathy, or anything of the kind, but, as I think, as a matter of simple justice to the family of a man who was killed on his own place, engaged in work, under the very eyes of his family, and killed through the negligence of the employees of the United States Government. It seems to me that there are no two sides to the question.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] assures me that this woman will have to place a number of her minor children in the poorhouse if this relief is not granted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was mistaken; in the orphans' asylum.

Mr. NEW. But in any event they will become objects of charity, dependent upon the public for support, in case this relief is not granted.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall withdraw all opposition to the bill and let it pass if there is no further opposition to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I shall not oppose the bill, but I am in hearty accord with the view expressed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. We are establishing a precedent that will come home to plague us, and it will be fruitful of bills for appropriation from the Treasury that will greatly increase the already overwhelming burden of public expenditure.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Colorado permit an inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask some one who may know whether it has been the custom of the United States Government to make compensation in such cases?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a long list of appropriations in bills—nearly a dozen—for improper and negligent use of firearms on testing grounds.

Mr. KING. They are lump-sum appropriations, are they not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. All of them are.

Mr. THOMAS. But here is a life annuity.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is only a 10-year annuity.

Mr. THOMAS. It is an annuity for a period of years; and we all know how those things grow in Congress. That is my objection to it. I shall not oppose it further, but I wish to be recorded as voting against it.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not think it a very dangerous precedent for the Government to pay for a tort or negligence of all persons who are in the employ of the Government? I have in my files claims by four individuals who claim to have received injuries at different times, through negligence of employees of the Government, and they want the Government to pay for the injuries which they sustained. In one claim the claimant alleges that a man who was driving a Government van ran into him and seriously injured him. He thinks he ought to have \$10,000 for the injuries sustained, and if the injuries are as serious as he claims them to be I have no doubt in the world in a private suit a jury would give him damages in that amount. The Government has had five or six millions of soldiers and employees under its jurisdiction during the past two years. I have not any doubt in the world there have been hundreds and thousands of accidents as a result of the activities of soldiers and employees of the Government. I have not any doubt in the world that hundreds and thousands of individuals have received serious injuries to their person, and property has been damaged and injured as the result of the carelessness and negligence of individuals employed by the Government, in the line of their employment and within the scope of their employment.

It occurs to me that if the Government were responsible for all their acts of omission, all their negligence, all their defaults in duty, we will have claims against the Government aggregating millions and millions of dollars, and we will be establishing a precedent that will call, for years to come, for millions and tens of millions of dollars.

Does the Senator say there is a precedent and that the Government has in the past laid down the proposition that it will pay for all the defaults and negligence of all persons in its employ?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I have said nothing of the kind, but I do say that in cases of this character there have been a number of bills passed, and that I think it would be utterly indefensible for the Government to decline to pay this claim. Each case stands in a measure upon its own facts. The propriety of the Government paying depends upon the peculiar facts of each case. Here is a case of an Artillery training ground. Here is a farmer quite a distance away, entirely out of the range of legitimate fire, free from all danger if the officers managing the practice grounds did their duty. The farmer is killed by the negligence of those in charge of the training grounds. An investigation is made, and the officers report that the death was due to the indefensible negligence of those in charge, who disregarded distance, disregarded proper direction, and improperly used the target grounds. This man was at work at a place where the Government engineers had, by their decision, advised him that he would be safe. He was working in his field and was killed by the improper and negligent discharge of a gun. Who ought to stand that loss? Ought all the people to stand the loss, or ought the widow and the nine children stand the loss? That is the case that is before us.

The man had nine children, the oldest 16 years and the youngest 4 months old. A tenant farmer at work upon his farm, he had been able to make enough to take care of them. Ought all the public to stand the loss or ought the widow and nine children to stand it?

Mr. KIRBY. May I inquire what committee reported the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It was reported by the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Committee on Claims reported it. It has already passed the House. I only want to add that I called on the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress for a report as to whether similar bills had been passed heretofore, and they furnished me a list of about a dozen bills passed for relief in cases of the improper discharge of guns at Artillery training camps, the bills involving various sums. I ask that this list may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The list referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES LAWS RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES RESULTING FROM TARGET PRACTICE.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., 586). Secretary of War authorized to adjust and report on claims for damages to private property, not over \$1,000, occasioned by heavy gun fire and target practice.

2. PRIVATE ACTS.

Act of February 16, 1907 (34 Stat., 2413). Payment of \$100 for killing of two horses by Army troops engaged in target practice.

Act of February 16, 1907 (34 Stat., 2413). Payment of \$325 for damages to property incident to Army target practice.

Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., 1868). Payment of \$432.50 for injuries sustained by minor children by accidental explosion of a shell near Artillery target range.

Act of February 20, 1911 (36 Stat., 1995). Payment of \$50 for damages to property during Artillery target practice.

Act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat., 2023). Payment of \$1,080 for benefit of surviving mother of person killed through negligence and carelessness of troops engaged in target practice.

Act of February 7, 1913 (37 Stat., 1361). Payment of \$500 to father of Navy seaman killed in discharge of his duty during target practice.

Act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat., 1304). Payment of \$2,500 to widow of person killed by marines in discharge of their duty in target practice.

Act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat., 1309). Payment of \$80 for horse killed by shell fire by Artillery while at target practice.

Act of September 15, 1914 (38 Stat., 1456). Payment of \$1,500 for loss of one eye, etc., caused by wound received at hands of party of sailors and marines engaged at target practice.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator is perfectly right in saying the Senate has heretofore made appropriations for such cases, but it never made an appropriation in this way, as I stated. It has appropriated a lump sum, the same as it has done in the past for other causes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But that money was appropriated only to pay the damage for the killing of a horse, or something of that kind. Congress has appropriated money to meet the damage in each instance, but this appropriation does not nearly meet the damage to this widow.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] might go a good deal further and call attention to hundreds of millions of dollars which the Government of the United States has paid out when there has been damage done to property of the people in the United States. I am a member of the Committee on Claims, and I have very often become impatient with the idea that when human lives are taken they shall not be considered. I believe we ought to pay this woman, I care not whether she is a poor woman or a rich woman. This man's life was destroyed, and Government officials were responsible for it. I am sure that if we had destroyed a ship or destroyed property belonging to some citizen of the United States we would not have hesitated for a moment, but would have allowed a legitimate claim for the destruction of the property. I am sick and tired, Mr. President, of the idea that when citizens are injured or human lives are being destroyed the claims shall not be paid. As one member of the Committee on Claims I shall certainly support the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can not permit the statement of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to end this discussion without assuring the Senate that my objection to the bill has nothing to do with the circumstances or character of the claim. It is a matter to me of governmental power and of precedent.

The Senator says that if property were destroyed there would be no question about the promptness of enactment of a bill reimbursing the owner. That is only partially true, if we are to consider the vast number of bills which are introduced and which go to the Committee on Claims for property lost. I am quite frequently in receipt of petitions and appeals, both in person and by mail, to urge upon the Committee on Claims of the Senate the immediate consideration of claims for damage or destruction of property. I am very sure, when we consider the number of claims which are so allowed and contrast them with the number of claims which are disallowed and the number upon which final action is not taken, the Senator will modify his statement.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I have been on the Committee on Claims for a number of years. I know of no claim that has been disallowed where it has been proved beyond a question of doubt that the officials of the Government were at fault.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, I accept the Senator's statement. He knows more about it than I do. I base my opinion upon my experience, which is not identified with the action of the Committee on Claims at all; but I know a great many of the bills which are reported from the Committee on Claims are bitterly contested and a great many of them defeated on the floor of the Senate. So it is, I think, going a little too far to assert that we are discriminating between claims for damages growing out of the destruction of property and those which are intended as compensation for human life. The latter class of claims appeal to me, and I think to every man who is normal, much more keenly than mere compensation for the destruction of property.

The fundamental trouble is that the people are becoming more and more prone to come to Washington and ask for compensation, for reimbursement, for appropriations for everything which occurs in the various complications of human life, both in the social and in the industrial world, and we are quite as prone to receive them, and a good deal more prone to act upon them when they involve the human equation than otherwise.

The taxpayers must be considered sooner or later, because when the burden gets beyond their power to bear it they are going to collapse and the Government will collapse. We may keep on without regard to their condition, and to our duty, until the expenses of the Government so overlap its revenues as to make its financial future not only a contingency but a certainty of an ultimate necessary and radical transformation of our ways of doing business.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to say only one word, Mr. President. Of course, there is no other place to come but to Washington to adjust a claim like this. If the Government is responsible because of a certain department of the Government under which this whole trouble arose and the injury was inflicted, it has not the power to adjust it without some legislative authority. The War Department could not pay any claim, no matter how just and how proper and how right it might be. The claimant must come to Congress for relief in this instance. It seems to me it is an entirely legitimate and proper claim and ought to be paid.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will allow me, I might suggest the fact that the local board of officers investigating this matter recommended that the Secretary of War bring it to the attention of Congress, that compensation for the damage might be made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. Are we proceeding under Rule VIII with the consideration of unobjected bills, with one speech of five minutes by each Senator desiring to speak, or is the bill just generally before the Senate? There have been three or four speeches made by some Senators.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia what amount of money is carried by the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Fifty-seven dollars and fifty cents a month.

Mr. SMOOT. It amounts to \$6,000 in 10 years.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Fifty-seven and one-half dollars a month to pay a widow on her own behalf and on behalf of her nine minor children, because her husband, a hard-working man, who had been supporting his family, was killed through the negligence of officials of the Government while acting in a governmental capacity! I merely wanted to suggest to the Senator from Georgia, since I have noticed the difficulty he has had in promoting the passage of what seems to me to be a very meritorious measure, that it might facilitate its passage if he would increase the amount from \$57.50 a month to something like a million dollars or perhaps a hundred million dollars and make the beneficiaries the people of Upper Silesia instead of a widow and her nine children, citizens of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RIOT OF NEGRO SOLDIERS AT HOUSTON, TEX.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) directing the Court of Claims to investigate claims for damages growing out of the riot of United States negro soldiers at Houston, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the joint resolution goes over.

ELIZABETH WHITE.

The bill (S. 2672) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that bill go over.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Utah to withdraw his objection. The bill, I will state, is in favor of an old lady in the State of Louisiana, who is past 80 years of age. The bill has passed the House of Representatives twice; it has passed the Senate twice; and it was omitted by a clerical error from the omnibus claims bill which passed the Senate finally in March, 1915. It is to provide for the payment of a claim which was found to be just and proper by the Court of Claims. I therefore hope the Senator from Utah will not insist upon his objection. Unless the appropriation carried in the bill is speedily granted, it will not do this old lady any good at all. The claim has gone through the Court of Claims; it has gone

through both Houses of Congress. It is due simply to a clerical error that she did not get the money four years ago.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Louisiana is slightly in error, I think, when he says that the necessity for this legislation is due to a clerical error. This claim was carried in the omnibus claims bill at the close of the Sixty-fourth or Sixty-third Congress; I forget which.

Mr. RANDELL. It was the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. It was the last omnibus claims bill considered by Congress, no matter what the session was, and, like many other claims, was stricken from the omnibus bill because it did not fall within the character and class of claims which it had been agreed by both Houses of Congress should be paid. That, I will say to the Senator, is the fact of the matter; and that is why I ask that the bill now go over; for if this claim is paid, Mr. President, every claim that was then stricken from that omnibus claims bill should be paid.

Mr. RANDELL. This claim was not stricken from the omnibus claims bill to which the Senator refers. There was a motion made to strike it from the bill, but the motion was overruled, and the claim was incorporated in the bill as passed by the House. When it came to the Senate the committee reported an amendment striking the claim from the bill, but that was overruled, and it remained in the omnibus claims bill; and, I repeat, but for a clerical error made during the last hours of the session the amount would have been paid to this old lady years ago. However, the bill did pass the Senate in the Sixtieth and the Sixty-first Congresses, and it passed the other House in the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses. We have acted on the bill twice, and when it was included in the omnibus claims bill that was the third time it came before the Senate. It certainly is a meritorious claim.

This old lady, as I have said, is 80 years of age; she is in very distressing circumstances; she needs the money badly; and, Senators, it would be cruel not to give it to her at this time. I therefore appeal to the Senator from Utah not to insist upon his objection, and to let the bill go through.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this claim was rejected by the Senate on March 3, 1915. At that time a proposed amendment striking this claim from the bill was made the subject of debate; and by a vote of the Senate was rejected.

I know it is hard, Mr. President, to stand here and resist the appeal of a Senator who says that this is the claim of a woman 80 years of age; but this is one of the old claims that fell outside of the rule of the Committee on Claims in considering such matters.

In further answer to the Senator in relation to these claims, I desire to say that this bill only emphasizes a practice that has been followed in the Senate and in the other House for years; and a very bad practice, too. The House pays very little attention to claims when they come up there in the form of House bills, because it is said the Senate will give careful consideration to them. The Senate also has passed bills time and time again thinking that they will not be considered favorably by the House. That is a practice that ought to cease.

Mr. RANDELL. Let me ask the Senator from Utah if the Court of Claims did not have this claim before it, and if they did not find that this amount was due?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not had time to closely examine the matter.

Mr. RANDELL. That is what the report says—that the claim was before the Court of Claims and they found a certain amount was due for sugar and molasses taken, and that a certain amount was due for the use of a steamboat that belonged to the estate of the deceased.

Mr. SMOOT. If we had time to call a quorum of the Senate to discuss this question, decide as to its merits, and then take a vote upon it, I would not now ask that it go over; but we have not time now to fully consider the matter.

Mr. RANDELL. If we take that course it means the denial of justice to this lady. The bill, I repeat, was acted on four years ago; it was in the omnibus claims bill, and was stricken out because of a clerical error. Under those circumstances, it seems to me very hard for the Senator from Utah to insist upon his objection in view of the fact that the bill has twice passed the Senate, twice passed the other House, and had been included in the omnibus claims bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall have to ask that the bill go over for the present, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN H. RHEINLANDER.

The bill (S. 1302) for the relief of John H. Rheinlander was announced as next in order.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

THE TEXAS CO.

The bill (S. 1255) authorizing the Texas Co. to bring suit against the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no report from any of the departments upon this measure, and I ask that it go over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I should like to know to what department the Senator from Utah is referring. I wish to know for my own guidance.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill relates to damages caused by a collision, and I do not know whether the collision was with a steamer under the control of the Treasury Department—that is, a steamer of the Public Health Service—or whether the vessel was under the control of the War Department; but whatever department had control of the vessel which was involved in the collision, I think the committee ought to secure a report from that department, secure full details, and ascertain what, if any, action has been taken by the department.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well; I will endeavor to have that course pursued.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Utah that the committee looked upon the bill merely as conferring authority to present to the Court of Claims the question of damages resulting to the steamer *Texas* from the collision between that steamer and a United States steamship. Every detail of the claim will be considered by the Court of Claims? The bill appropriates no money, but merely, I repeat, confers authority on the Court of Claims to hear the case.

Mr. SMOOT. Similar claims to the one involved in this measure have been settled, as they will be settled in the future, after a survey made by the officials of the department controlling the steamer. I can not see why this claim should be treated in any other way than that, and before I would feel justified in letting the claim go to the Court of Claims I should want to know whether the department has taken any action in respect to it, whether a survey was made, and what the findings were.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 413) for the relief of the Canadian Car & Foundry Co. (Ltd.) was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS MACHINE TOOLS.

The bill (S. 3125) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus machine tools and other equipment to the Federal Board for Vocational Education was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "Department," to insert "on the filing with the War Department of an itemized receipt for the articles thus transferred. The Federal Board for Vocational Education shall annually report to Congress the disposition and use of the articles, the transfer of which is herein authorized," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War shall have authority to transfer to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, without compensation therefor, certain surplus machine tools and other equipment of the approximate value of \$250,000 belonging to the War Department and now in possession of the Federal board and being used by that board as equipment in schools for vocational education controlled by the board. Property so transferred shall be dropped from the records of the War Department on the filing with the War Department of an itemized receipt for the articles thus transferred. The Federal Board for Vocational Education shall annually report to Congress the disposition and use of the articles, the transfer of which is herein authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I think this bill or a bill similar to it was passed a few days ago.

Mr. SMOOT. There was objection made to the bill at that time, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I thought the objection was withdrawn.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSTRUCTION OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 3126) authorizing the detail of commissioned officers of the Army to take courses of instruction within two years from date of commission was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no provision of existing law with reference to the detail or assignment of officers of the Regular Army shall hereafter operate to prevent within a period of two years from date of first

commission the detail or assignment of any commissioned officer of the Regular Army to take a basic course of instruction at a service school in the duties of his arm or branch of the service.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOAD LINES FOR VESSELS.

The bill (S. 575) to establish load lines for certain vessels was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask that for the bill the title of which has just been read there be substituted Calendar No. 239, being the bill (H. R. 3621) to establish load lines for certain vessels. The House bill is practically the same as the Senate bill, with one or two minor changes, perhaps bettering the bill somewhat. I was authorized by the Commerce Committee to report the House bill and ask that it be substituted on the calendar for the Senate bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill on the calendar and the Senate bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida insist upon taking up the measure now? It is a rather long bill, consisting of eight or nine pages.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is quite a long bill, but I will say to the Senator that the bill has been referred to the Shipping Board and the Department of Commerce and both have approved it. It was really prepared as a result of the joint work of the Shipping Board and the Department of Commerce, through their officers, and they regard it as very important.

I know there is some objection to the idea of establishing a load line at all; but we are about the only country in the world that has not some provision of that kind in its maritime laws. The department feels it is quite important; we have no legislation of that character now, and it is believed that it is very desirable that we make provision for establishing a load line below which vessels can not be loaded on salt water.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator, too, that as I understand this will enable our officials to meet discriminations on the part of other countries that work against our shipping by reason of their load-line laws? At present, as we have no such law, we can not do it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; that is one reason why they think it is important to establish by law a load line. The method of doing it has met the approval of the departments, and it is considered a very important thing. If we are going to do it at all, we ought to do it now, in order that the necessary machinery may be established for taking care of that situation. They consider it quite important.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if hearings have been held upon this bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not recall that we had any formal hearings on it. The committee considered it during the last Congress and reported out a bill, and, of course, we conferred with the officers in the different departments, the Shipping Board people, and the Department of Commerce people. I do not know that we had any formal hearings on it. I do not think we did.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say that we had no formal hearings, and no objections have come to the committee against it from any of the shipping interests. It was pending before the committee for quite a good while, and, as the Senator says, was reported at the last Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have received only one letter on the subject, and that is from Mr. Pendleton, of Pendleton Bros. (Inc.), shipbuilders and brokers, of New York. They oppose the passage of any law regulating the load-line proposition.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that I have not studied the bill carefully, but I observe that there are a number of penalties in it, and apparently it is a very important bill, and I do not think we ought to pass it in a hurry. I think I shall ask that it go over for to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Order of Business 239 is substituted for Order of Business 208, and it will be passed over.

Mr. FLETCHER subsequently said:

Mr. President the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] made inquiry with regard to hearings on this load-line bill. I stated that the only opposition to it that had come to my notice was a letter from Mr. Fields S. Pendleton, of Pendleton Bros., and I think, in fairness to both sides and to all concerned, that that letter might go into the RECORD, so that when this matter is taken up again for consideration it can be referred to. I ask to have the letter included in the RECORD in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, October 18, 1919.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Apropos of our conversation of Thursday, I write to ask if you would have the load-line bill (S. 575) recalled to the Commerce Committee, so that the owners might be heard, because, in my judgment, it is a matter that means a great deal to American shipping and is too important a matter to be enacted into law until American shipowners have an opportunity to present their side of the case.

To my knowledge, this matter has been before Congress a number of times. I am quite sure Gen. Grosvenor was chairman of the House committee when it came up, and after a hearing and protest by the owners it was turned down. We took it up with Senator Frye and Senator Mallory, and they were both against the bill, so we did not have much worry in the Senate, as they were the leaders on both sides in the Commerce Committee on shipping matters.

We believe that the loading of a ship should be left to the master. He knows his ship, he knows the kind of cargo he is carrying, and he knows the voyage he must make, and whether the weather will be fair or stormy in the latitudes that he goes into.

A proper load line from Pensacola to Habana, in January, is not a proper load line for the same month from Pensacola to Boston, for on the latter voyage a vessel would ice up, and sometimes get from 300 to 500 tons of ice on her hull and rigging. Furthermore, a load line from Hampton Roads to Boston in the summer time is not a proper load line from Hampton Roads to Boston in the wintertime. The master of the ship decides all of these things, knowing how his ship performs in gales and storms; he is risking his own life and has more at stake than anybody else. He is supreme in command, and it is not right to dictate to him any more than it is how he should handle his ship in a storm.

You could not load a ship any deeper with a load line on a short passage, when the weather is calm, than you could on a long passage, where you will have storms. One great advantage in not having a load line is that the master, by being able to use his own judgment, can carry more cargo at times than others, and in that way even up, so that in the end he can carry more tons of cargo and safer than if he was loading to the same draft at all times. This is the method of all prudent and skilled shipmasters. I can show you that vessels range from 10 per cent to 20 per cent difference in the loading of deadweight cargoes on different voyages and at different seasons of the year; and it will be time enough for the gentlemen who urge this legislation to show a single vessel that was lost by reason of being overloaded.

Senator, we have too much governmental regulation on shipping now, too many delays for inspections, time lost in making applications, in getting inspectors to come on board of ships, in making their reports and filing them in the customhouse, and going through the routine of work in order to get the ship's papers, so that she may clear. All of these delays are costly.

The cargo-carrying trade of the future will be fuel, and Hampton Roads is going to control the world. A load line that permits a ship to load down only to a certain point at Hampton Roads in the summer time for a voyage around Cape Horn or Cape Good Hope will make her lose from 600 to 800 tons of cargo, for that is where the ship will get her stormy weather in their winter season. She will be lightened some 600 to 800 tons before getting to those points, and consequently would lose the freight on this amount of cargo, meaning from \$20,000 to \$30,000 on each voyage.

It is important that our ships be able, owing to the high cost of fuel, to take all of the bunker coal possible when leaving our ports. We are continually lightening the ship every day from 25 to 50 tons. We need this to overcome the excessive bunkering charges in foreign countries.

A few years ago a merchant in Europe or Africa could buy a 5,000-ton cargo of coal at Hampton Roads for \$9,000, or as low as \$1.80 per ton. To-day, for that same cargo, he must pay \$175,000, or \$35 per ton, cost and freight, before the ship sails. On his first cargo he would carry the coal in his own ship and the freight would be paid in Europe, while now American vessels have just begun to take away this trade.

The coal trade is the main thing that has built up England's shipping business. She exported before the war \$7,000,000 tons of coal and last year 27,000,000 tons. Bunker coal to-day in England is more than \$25 per ton, while ours at Hampton Roads is \$7.50. We shall need within the next 18 months all of the advantages that we can get. The shipping situation is no longer a fight of individuals and corporations; it has narrowed down to a fight of nations—Great Britain against the United States, with Japan crawling slowly for the control of the Pacific. England has never failed to protect her shipping at any cost, and since she started subsidies, in 1839, figuring interest at 6 per cent, she has paid, up to the beginning of the war, her shipowners \$3,500,000,000, which was more than her shipping was worth at that time.

It is a fight for freight to a finish. I predict that within 18 months we shall see the lowest freight rate, taking into consideration the cost of operation, that we have ever seen. There will be more ships than there are cargoes, and whoever can do the business the cheapest will continue. The Englishman has always had the business and will fight hard to hold it. We can not expect to drive them out of business on the same basis of profit that we can attract new American capital into it. With more ships than cargoes, the freight rate will drop to a point that makes it unprofitable for one or the other to continue shipbuilding. The question is: Will Great Britain be able to build and operate cheaper than the United States? If we have some little advantage now in the load line, we can not afford to give it up.

Very respectfully,

FIELDS S. PENDLETON.

WATER SUPPLY, SUNNYSIDE, UTAH.

The bill (S. 46) for the protection of the water supply of the town of Sunnyside, Utah, was considered in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the public lands within the several townships and subdivisions thereof hereinafter enumerated, situated in the county of Carbon and State of Utah, are hereby reserved from all forms of location, entry, or appropriation, whether under the mineral or nonmineral land laws of the United States, and set aside as a municipal water-supply reserve for the use and benefit of the people of the town of Sunnyside, a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, as follows, to wit: The south half of south half of section 34, in township 13 south, range 14 east, Salt Lake base and meridian; and also the following lands which, when surveyed, will be described as follows, to wit: All of section 11; west half of section 12; all of section 13; and all of section 14, in township 14 south, range 14 east, of Salt Lake base and meridian.

SEC. 2. That the lands heretofore described and reserved for municipal water-supply purposes shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with and at the exclusive expense of the town of Sunnyside, Utah, for the purpose of storing, conserving, and protecting from pollution the said water supply, and preserving, improving, and increasing the timber growth on said lands, to more fully accomplish such purposes; and to that end said municipality shall have the right, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to the use of any and all parts of the lands reserved for the storage and conveying of water and construction and maintenance thereon of all improvements for such purposes.

SEC. 3. That the said Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe and enforce such regulations as he may find necessary to carry out the purpose of this act, including the right to forbid persons other than those authorized by him and the municipal authorities of said municipal corporation from entering or otherwise trespassing upon these lands, and any violation of this act or of regulations issued thereunder shall be punishable as is provided for in section 50 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States, approved March 4, 1909" (35 Stat. L., p. 1098), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 857).

SEC. 4. That this act shall be subject to all legal rights heretofore acquired under any law of the United States, and the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2189) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The bill (S. 2789) for the consolidation of forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized to accept on behalf of the United States title to any lands within the Sierra National Forest, Calif., if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture the public interests will be benefited thereby and the lands are chiefly valuable for national forest purposes, and in exchange therefor may give not to exceed an equal value of such national forest land or timber or assignable certificates for timber within the national forests in California as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and in determining the relative values of the lands or timber to be exchanged, consideration shall be given to any reservations which either party may make of timber, minerals, or easements. Such assignable certificates for timber shall be issued under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be for the agreed value of lands acquired, and shall be acceptable only at their face value when accompanying bids for the purchase of national forest timber or in payment for national forest timber in California when purchased under existing laws and regulations. Timber given in such exchanges shall be cut and removed under the laws and regulations relating to the national forests, and under the direction and supervision and in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance of title, become a part of the Sierra National Forest.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMISSION ON RURAL AND URBAN HOME SETTLEMENT.

The bill (S. 2444) to create the commission on rural and urban home settlement was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BAR OF DISLOYALISTS.

The bill (S. 2323) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Utah is informed in regard to the provisions of this bill. I should like to state the substance of it, and then, if the Senator has any objection, all right.

Mr. KING. I will withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Section 3480 of the Revised Statutes prohibits any person who participated in the so-called Rebellion from prosecuting any claim against the United States. Since that time the soldiers and the postmasters have been allowed to collect their claims when found upon the books of the Treasury Department to be due these parties for services performed prior to the war. The only persons who have not been allowed to collect their claims are the sailors and the marines, and this bill repeals that section in their interest. That is all it is. It simply allows the marines and sailors to collect the claims due them on the books of the Treasury. It amounts to only about twenty to fifty thousand dollars. Having paid the postmasters and having paid the soldiers, I do not see and the committee did not see why we should not pay the sailors and marines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, in line 4, after the words "United States," to insert "approved July 6, 1914," and in line 6, after the word "Revenue," to insert a hyphen and the word "Cutter," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," approved July 6, 1914, be amended by adding after the word "Army" the words "Navy, Marine Corps, and Revenue-Cutter Service."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS IN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA.

The bill (S. 2798) authorizing the removal of stumps from cut-over Oregon and California lands was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this involves any expense to the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. None whatever.

Mr. NORRIS. In that connection, I notice that upon the face of the bill it does not appear what the object is. There is no money paid for the removal of these stumps. What reason is there for the enactment of the measure, and what is expected to be accomplished by it?

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps I had better read the report from the Acting Secretary of the Interior. That explains it in as few words as possible. This is a letter addressed by the Acting Secretary of the Interior to Mr. FERRIS, the chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the House. He says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, August 14, 1917.

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS.

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: I am in receipt of your favor of the 4th instant, transmitting a copy of H. R. 5645—

That is the same as this bill—

with the request that a report be furnished to the committee thereon, together with such suggestions and recommendations as I may desire to make.

This bill, entitled "A bill authorizing removal of stumps from cut-over Oregon and California lands," had its origin in a request addressed to the department through members of the Oregon delegation, asking for the privilege of removing stumps suitable for making ship knees from the cut-over Oregon and California grant lands, which were reverted in the United States by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat., 218).

Under the act of reversion, no authority exists for the disposition of either the land or the timber thereon until due classification and an order for the restoration thereof. The request, accordingly, could not be granted under the existing law.

There is an urgent emergency, however, for ship-knee timber, such as may be secured from stumps standing on the Oregon and California cut-over lands. The removal of the stumps will add to the value of the land when it is ready for disposition. The bill enables this department to protect all possible interests of the United States or others which may be affected by it, and I would, accordingly, recommend its passage.

Cordially, yours,

ALEXANDER T. VOGELSONG,
Acting Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, after line 11, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make any and all regulations found necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall be, and is hereby, authorized to grant within his discretion free permits for the removal of stumps from cut-over timberlands embraced within the former grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and reverted in the United States by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat., p. 218), subject to such terms and conditions as he may impose for the protection of all rights and interests of the United States and such others, if any, that may be affected thereby.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make any and all regulations found necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATTHEW McDONALD.

The bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Matthew McDonald was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withdraw that objection for a minute. Mr. McDonald was only 11 years of age when he enlisted in the Navy. He served two months, and was taken out by his mother on a letter from the governor of the State. On the records of the Navy he is carried as a deserter. Of course, he had no right to enlist without the consent of his parents before he was 18. At his own request an amendment is recommended to the bill that no pension shall ever be paid on account of his service; so it is proposed simply to correct his record.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator whether automatically, under existing law, he would not receive a pension?

Mr. CURTIS. No; the bill especially provides that he shall not, and the amendment was recommended at his request. Under the ordinary wording of bills he would draw a pension; but at his suggestion an amendment was prepared providing that no pension, back pay, or bounty shall ever be paid on account of that service.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to my colleague that a provision of that kind is so uncommon in bills of this nature that I was surprised when I read it.

Mr. KING. I withdraw the objection. I supposed that the plan was the one usually pursued, namely, to receive a pensionable status, and then the first thing the deserter does is to get a pension.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "shall," to strike out "accrue prior to the passage of this act" and insert "be allowed, and no back pay and bounty shall be paid because of the enactment of this legislation," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws Matthew McDonald shall be hereafter held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States Navy October 20, 1863: *Provided,* That no pension shall be allowed and no back pay and bounty shall be paid because of the enactment of this legislation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3201) fixing the salary of the district attorney for the eastern district of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LANDS IN IDAHO.

The bill (S. 1300) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Minidoka, Idaho, for railroad purposes was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "by," to strike out "appraisal" and insert "the Secretary of the Interior, in order to return the expenditure heretofore made or proposed for the irrigation of the lands," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell and convey to Oregon Short Line Railroad Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Utah and authorized to do business in the State of Idaho, its successors and assigns, for railroad purposes, and at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior in order to return the expenditure heretofore made or proposed for the irrigation of the lands at not less than \$50 per acre, and under such terms, conditions, and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, the following described land, situated in Minidoka County, Idaho:

All that part of the west half of the southeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 2, and the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter of section 11, all in township 8 south, range 25 east of the Boise meridian, within the following described area:

Beginning at the intersection of the present southeasterly right of way boundary of the Twin Falls Branch of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. with the section line common to said sections 2 and 11, 100 feet southeasterly from and at right angles to the center line of main track of said railroad, said intersection also bearing north 89° 5' west, 460.1 feet from the quarter section corner common to said sections 2 and 11; thence north 40° 25' east along said southeasterly right of way boundary, being 100 feet southeasterly from and parallel to said center line of main track, for a distance of 1,726.8 feet; thence south 0° 1' east, and parallel to the north and south center line of said section 2, for a distance of 1,332.6 feet, to a point in the section line common to said sections 2 and 11; thence continuing south 0° 1' east, and parallel to the north and south center line of said section 11, for a distance of 1,320 feet, to the south line of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter of

said section 11; thence north 89° 5' west, along said south line, for a distance of 2,229.5 feet, to a point in the present southeasterly right of way boundary of said railroad; thence north 40° 25' east, along said right of way boundary, and being 100 feet southeasterly from and parallel to said center line of main track, for a distance of 1,710.4 feet, to the point of beginning, and containing in all 67.87 acres, more or less, within the proposed pumping unit of the Minidoka project of the United States Reclamation Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS.

The bill (S. 2188) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L., p. 1133), was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L., p. 1133), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That section 4 of the act of August 18, 1894, entitled 'An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes,' be, and the same is hereby, amended so that the 10-year period within which any State shall cause the lands applied for under said act to be irrigated and reclaimed, as provided in said section, as amended by the act of June 11, 1896, shall begin to run from the date of approval by the Secretary of the Interior of the State's application for the segregation of such lands; and if actual construction of reclamation works is not begun within three years after the segregation of the lands or within such further period as shall be allowed by the Secretary of the Interior, the said Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may restore such lands to the public domain; and if the State fails, within 10 years from the date of such segregation, to cause the whole or any part of the lands so segregated to be so irrigated and reclaimed, the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, continue said segregation for a period not exceeding five years, or may, in his discretion, restore such lands to the public domain upon the expiration of the 10-year period or of any extension thereof."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSITION OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The bill (S. 2379) to provide for the disposition of certain public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 847), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 497), and which are no longer needed, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior any lands which have been withdrawn under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 847), as amended by the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 497), for the purpose of exploratory drilling to discover water supplies for irrigation or other purposes, and which have had wells or other permanent improvements placed thereon by and at the expense of the United States, are no longer needed for the purpose for which they were withdrawn and improved, the Secretary of the Interior may appraise the lands, together with the improvements thereon, and thereafter sell the same for not less than the appraised value at public auction to the highest bidder, after giving public notice of the time and place of sale by posting upon the land and publication for not less than 30 days in a newspaper of general circulation in the vicinity of the land.

SEC. 2. That upon payment of the purchase price the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by appropriate patent to convey all the right, title, and interest in and to said lands to the purchaser at said sale, subject, however, to such reservations, limitations, or conditions as said Secretary may deem proper: *Provided*, That not over 160 acres shall be sold to any one person.

SEC. 3. That the moneys derived from the sale of such lands and improvements be disposed of as are other receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF SCHOOL-TEACHERS.

The bill (H. R. 5818) for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am in favor of this bill with some modifications, but it will need considerable attention, and as there are only a few moments of the morning hour remaining I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL.

The bill (S. 3224) relating to the creation in the Army of the United States of the grade of lieutenant general was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES FOR ARMY.

The bill (S. 3239) to amend the Army appropriation act for 1920, so as to authorize travel allowances to persons discharged from disciplinary barracks and other places of confinement other than honorably, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, under the heading "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the following words: "for travel allowance to persons on their discharge from the United States disciplinary barracks or from any place in which they have been held under a sentence of dishonorable discharge and confinement for more than six months, or from the Government Hospital for the Insane, after transfer thereto from such barracks or place to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment"; and substituting therefor the following words: "for travel allowance to all persons discharged the service of the United States otherwise than honorably, from the place of discharge or release, if thereafter detained at the Government Hospital for the Insane or otherwise held in restraint under proper authority, to their bona fide homes (or elsewhere as they may elect with the approval of the discharging officer), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the man's bona fide home."

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 9, to strike out the words "if thereafter," and in line 10 to insert the word "whether," so that the clause would read:

For travel allowance to all persons discharged the service of the United States otherwise than honorably, from the place of discharge or release, whether detained at the Government Hospital for the Insane, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS BY INDIANS IN WASHINGTON.

The bill (S. 157) authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington and west of the summit of the Cascade Mountains to submit to the Court of Claims certain claims growing out of treaties and otherwise was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature, both legal and equitable, of the tribes and bands of Indians, or any of them, with whom any of the treaties of Medicine Creek, dated December 26, 1854; Point Elliott, dated January 22, 1855; Point-no-Point, dated January 26, 1855; the Quin-al-ets, dated May 8, 1859, growing out of said treaties, or any of them, including claims for allotments of land, or the value thereof, which they failed to receive under any of said treaties; and that all claims of whatever nature, both legal and equitable, which the Muckleshoot, San Juan Island Indians; Nook-Sack, Chinook, Upper Chehalis, Lower Chehalis, and Humpthulp Tribes or Bands of Indians, or any of them (with whom no treaty has been made), may have against the United States shall be submitted to the Court of Claims, with right of appeal by either party to the Supreme Court of the United States for determination and jurisdiction, both legal and equitable, is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine any and all suits brought hereunder and to render final judgment therein: *Provided*, That the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States shall not extend to those tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, with whom no treaty has been made: *Provided further*, That the court shall also consider and determine any legal or equitable defenses, set-offs, or counter claims which the United States may have against any of said tribes, bands, or individual Indians.

SEC. 2. That the Court of Claims shall advance the cause or causes upon its docket for hearing, and shall have authority to determine and adjudicate all rights and claims, both legal and equitable, of said Indians, tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, and of the United States in the premises, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation.

SEC. 3. That suit or suits instituted hereunder shall be begun by such Indians, tribe, tribes, or bands of Indians, as parties plaintiff, and the United States as the party defendant. The petition or petitions may be verified by attorney or attorneys employed by such tribes or Indians upon information and belief as to the facts therein alleged, and no other verification shall be necessary: *Provided*, That the attorney or attorneys of said tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, shall be selected by the claimant Indian or Indians with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and upon final determination of such suit or suits the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to fix and determine a reasonable fee, not to exceed 10 per cent of the recovery, to be paid to the attorneys employed by the said tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, and the same shall be included in the decree and shall be paid out of any sum or sums found to be due said tribes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no report here from the Interior Department or from any other department of the Government.

Mr. JONES of Washington rose.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Washington kindly explain this bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator that at the last Congress the Committee on Indian Affairs had quite extensive hearings on a similar bill. Representatives from the Bureau of Indian Affairs were present, as well as representatives of the Indians. The bill was referred to a subcommittee and hearings were had. The subcommittee reported to the full committee, which took the matter up very carefully and reported the

bill in exactly this form, and it passed the Senate at the last Congress. The amendment offered to the bill here was suggested by the department. I trust there will be no objection to it.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, line 2, to insert the words "within five years from the date of the passage of this act," so as to read:

That suits or suits instituted hereunder shall be begun within five years from the date of the passage of this act by such Indians, tribe, tribes, or bands of Indians as parties plaintiff and the United States as the party defendant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CORRECTION OF ERROR IN INDIAN ALLOTMENT.

The bill (S. 3115) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to correct an error in an Indian allotment was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of correcting an error made in the allotment on the public domain of Domatit E. Lafournaise, an Indian of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa, whereby the same is in conflict with the allotment of Jenoir Brien, a member of the same band, and to clear title to the land allotted to Jenoir Brien, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue a patent in fee to lot 5 of the southeast quarter of section 6, township 159 north, range 103 west of the principal meridian in North Dakota, in favor of Henry F. Thomas, holder of a deed to the allotment of Domatit E. Lafournaise (now Patnaude); said patent to issue upon the execution by Henry F. Thomas of a quitclaim deed in favor of E. L. Hugelen, purchaser of the allotment of Jenoir Brien and erroneously included in the allotment of Domatit E. Lafournaise.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

The resolution (S. Res. 215) providing that whenever the United States becomes a member of the league of nations this Government should present to the council or the assembly of the league the state of affairs in Ireland and the right of its people to self-government was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

NONMAILABLE MATTER.

The bill (S. 729) to amend section 217 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 217 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, be amended by striking therefrom the words "kill, or" in the last sentence thereof and by adding thereto the following:

"Whoever shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited for mailing or delivery, or shall knowingly cause to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at any place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, anything declared by this section to be nonmailable, with the design, intent, or purpose to kill the person to whom such article or thing is addressed, or any other person, shall suffer death.

"Any person violating any provisions of this act may be tried and punished either in the district in which the unlawful article or thing was mailed, or to which it was carried by mail for delivery according to the direction thereon, or in which it was caused to be delivered by mail to the person to whom it was addressed."

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, to strike out the words "suffer death," and to insert the words "upon conviction, be punished by death or imprisonment for not less than 20 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF JUDICIAL CODE.

The bill (S. 2692) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, some Senators have asked me what the bill means. It is the language of the law as it is now, but under the present law if a man has a claim against the Government he has to come here to Washington and sue before the Court of Claims if the amount involved is over \$10,000. If a man in South Dakota has an honest claim against the Government involving over \$10,000, he has to come to Washington, employ a lawyer, and bring a suit here. The bill extends the jurisdiction to \$100,000, and allows claimants to bring suits in their own districts, where the Government has its own district attorneys and is prepared to defend its own cases. I do not think there

ought to be any limitation at all, but the committee placed the limitation at \$100,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RETIRED PAY FOR CIVIL WAR SERVICE.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 146, the bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade.

Mr. SMOOT. We did not reach that bill to-day, I will say to the Senator. We began with calendar No. 200.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand, but this bill has been passed over several times. If it were the understanding that we should continue the consideration of the calendar until completed, I would not bring it up at this time; but I should like to have it disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that by unanimous consent it was agreed that we should take up the calendar under Rule VIII, beginning with Calendar No. 200.

Mr. McCUMBER. If that was the unanimous-consent agreement, Mr. President, I do not want to violate it.

STEPHEN A. WINCHELL.

The bill (S. 1374) for the relief of Stephen A. Winchell was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT.

The bill (S. 3288) further to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations and to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DETACHED SERVICE OF ARMY OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 3238) relating to detached service of officers of the Regular Army was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after the termination of the emergency incident to the war with Germany and Austria-Hungary, in the construction of any law relating to detached service of the officers of the Regular Army, all service performed by such officers during the said emergency shall be regarded as service with troops or organizations thereof.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF AMERICANIZATION.

The bill (S. 3315) to promote Americanization by providing for cooperation with the several States in the education of non-English-speaking persons and the assimilation of foreign-born residents, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF FARM-LOAN ACT.

The bill (H. R. 9065) to amend sections 3, 8, 10, 12, 20, and 21 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we can not consider that bill in the five minutes remaining, and I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDITIOUS ACTS.

The bill (S. 3317) to prohibit and punish certain seditious acts against the Government of the United States and to prohibit the use of the mails for the purpose of promoting such acts was announced as next in order.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think I will ask that the bill may go over. There are certain Senators very much interested in the bill who are not present. I would like to make a request in regard to the bill. The bill was introduced on behalf of the Judiciary Committee, referred to that committee, and immediately reported back, so that the bill was never printed until after the report of the committee. It has been suggested to me that because of the importance of the subject covered by the bill a little more publicity ought to be given to the measure. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator whether there was a committee report accompanying the bill?

Mr. STERLING. There is no committee report with the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no report indicated on my calendar, but I wondered whether a mistake had not been made in printing the calendar.

Mr. STERLING. No; there is no committee report. It was ordered to be reported favorably without amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator intend to submit a report upon the bill?

Mr. STERLING. No; no further report. I would like to say that I would not be quite content to leave the bill on the calendar, and I shall move its consideration at the earliest practicable date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is as follows:

[In the Senate of the United States. Oct. 22 (calendar day, Oct. 27), 1919. Mr. STERLING introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Oct. 22 (calendar day, Oct. 27), 1919. Reported by Mr. STERLING without amendment.]

A bill (S. 3317) to prohibit and punish certain seditious acts against the Government of the United States and to prohibit the use of the mails for the purpose of promoting such acts.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person to advocate or advise the overthrow, or to write, or knowingly to print, publish, utter, sell, or distribute any document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication, in or by which there is advised the overthrow, by force or violence, or by physical injury to person or property of the Government of the United States or of all government, or to advise or advocate a change in the form of government or the Constitution of the United States or resistance to the authority thereof by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property, or by force or violence to prevent, hinder, or delay or attempt to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the display or exhibition at any meeting, gathering, or parade, public or private, of any flag, banner, or emblem intended by the person or persons displaying or exhibiting the same to symbolize or indicate a purpose to overthrow by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property, the Government of the United States or all government, is hereby declared to be unlawful.

SEC. 3. That every document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication in or by which there is advocated or advised the overthrow by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property of the Government of the United States or of all government, or in or by which there is advocated or advised the use of force or violence or physical injury to or the seizure or destruction of persons or property as a means toward the accomplishment of economic, industrial, or political changes is hereby declared to be nonmailable and the same shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to authorize any person other than an employee of the Dead Letter Office duly authorized thereto or other person upon a search warrant authorized by law to open any letter not addressed to himself.

SEC. 4. That it shall be unlawful to import or cause to be imported into the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction any matter declared by section 3 of this act to be nonmailable or to transport or cause to be transported any such matter from one State to another or into any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 5. That whoever shall use or attempt to use the mails or the Postal Service of the United States for the transmission of any matter declared by section 3 of this act to be nonmailable or who shall violate any other of the provisions of this act shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, and if an alien, shall be, upon the expiration of his sentence, deported from the United States and forever barred from reentering the United States or any Territory under its jurisdiction.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

The bill (H. R. 9821) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DEPORTATION OF UNDESIRABLE ALIENS.

The bill (H. R. 6750) to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. This completes the call of the calendar.

RETIRED PAY FOR CIVIL WAR SERVICE.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 146, the bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator tell me why he objects? Mr. KING. Because I do not think the bill has merit, from what I understand of the facts concerning it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service in the regular or volunteer forces prior to April 9, 1865, shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade upon the retired list by reason of such service: *Provided*, That if such advanced rank or rating shall not carry with it an increase of pay of 20 per cent, or if there be no higher enlisted grade to which advancement may be made as herein authorized, then and in such cases said men shall receive an increase of pay of 20 per cent over and above the retired pay actually received by them, respectively, at the time of the passage of this act.

SEC. 2. That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the pay of any person in the Navy or Marine Corps, and that its provisions shall not operate to create any claim for back pay.

SEC. 3. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act be, and are hereby, repealed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I will simply read the last paragraph of the report of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Acting Secretary of the Navy. He says:

All the enlisted men (approximately 27) to be benefited by this bill (S. 131) have had at least 30 years' service for enlisted men and are not placed on the retired list unless they have had that amount of service or more. Similar benefits to those provided in this bill were given several years ago to all commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and the Revenue-Cutter Service on the retired list whose records showed creditable Civil War service.

This is to place on the retired list the few remaining in the military service who have had Civil War service. Last August there were about 27 men, and the cost will be between two and three thousand dollars.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The purpose of this bill is, I understand, to give a pensionable status to persons who have served in the Revenue-Cutter Service, giving them the same status as if they had served in the Navy of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; this is not a pension matter at all. It simply provides for their retirement at the next higher grade after they have served 30 years. They are entitled to be retired either at the grade they were then holding or one grade higher. The law gives a higher retirement grade to all the others, and this is recommended as covering these 27.

Mr. KING. But their retirement, if the Senator will pardon me, would call for retirement pay. It would give them an enlarged rate of pay.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; and for the whole number it would amount to somewhere about \$2,500 a year. This is simply intended to cover those who served in the Civil War, and who have had 30 years' service. It is not prospective, but covers those who have had that length of service.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator if it is not in line with the scheme which is now proposed to place the Revenue-Cutter Service in the same category with the naval service, giving the revenue-cutter officers the same status as officers in the Navy, the same advantages, the same retirement pay, and so forth?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany in open executive session.

Mr. McCUMBER. I call attention to the fact that it is not 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. But I can make the motion at any time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senate has just voted to take up this bill.

Mr. LODGE. I know, but I do not want it to remain the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The motion of the Senator from Massachusetts is in order.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not yielded to the Senator, and I do not know how he could take me off my feet to make the motion. I admit that at 2 o'clock perhaps another motion may come up, but scarcely at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Of course the arrival of the hour of 2 o'clock does not affect the open executive session. The hour of 2 o'clock applies only to legislative session. The motion I make is a privileged one. I do not want to cut the Senator from North Dakota off, but I do not want to let this bill become the unfinished business, because there are other bills which are more important.

Mr. McCUMBER. Nor do I, Mr. President. I want a vote on it now, if we can dispose of it.

Mr. LODGE. If we can vote on the bill and dispose of it, I have no objection.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the special rule for the morning hour on Monday. However, the hour of 2 o'clock having ar-

rived, the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts is now in order. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany in open executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to call up the unanimous-consent agreement which I presented on Friday and which has been printed, but before doing so I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McKellar	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McLean	Shields
Borah	Harding	McNary	Simmons
Brandeggee	Harrison	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Henderson	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Dial	Kendrick	Owen	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	Trammell
Elkins	Keyes	Phelan	Underwood
Fernald	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kirby	Pittman	Warren
France	La Follette	Poinexter	Watson
Gay	Lodge	Pomerene	Williams
Gerry	McCormick	Ransdell	Wolcott
Gore	McCumber	Robinson	

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate on official business. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are absent on account of illness. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are detained by illness in their families. The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are absent on public business.

I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has gone to Massachusetts to vote at the State election.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement, which I presented on Friday last and which is lying on the desk, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed agreement.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Wednesday, November 12, 1919, the Senate will vote finally upon the resolution of ratification of the pending treaty of peace with Germany; that on and after the calendar day of Monday, November 3, 1919, up to the calendar day of Monday, November 10, 1919, no Senator shall speak more than once nor for a longer period than one hour upon any amendment to the text of the treaty or upon any amendment proposed or that may be proposed to the resolution of ratification, or to any reservation pending or offered thereto; that on and after the calendar day of Monday, November 10, 1919, no Senator shall speak more than once nor for a longer period than 10 minutes upon any amendment pending or offered to the text of the treaty or upon any amendment pending or proposed to the resolution of ratification, or to any reservation proposed to be incorporated therein; that at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., on the calendar day of Wednesday, November 12, 1919, debate shall end and voting shall begin and shall be proceeded with until all amendments and reservations and the perfected resolution of ratification have been finally disposed of: *Provided*, That nothing in this agreement shall prevent the Senate from voting upon any amendment or reservation as the same is reached.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only desire to say that I shall not insist on any particular date. If the Senate desires to make it earlier, I shall not insist upon the limitations of time set forth nor upon the division of time. There is only one thing that I do insist upon, and that is that the unanimous consent, if entered into, shall be an effective one; that it shall provide for the final vote on the resolution of ratification; that it shall be efficient and effective in that way. That is the only point that I shall insist upon in regard to the proposed agreement. Otherwise, I am entirely ready to modify it as the best judgment of the Senate thinks it should be modified.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the objection to the unanimous-consent agreement asked by the Senator from Massachusetts is a very vital one, so far as the supporters of the treaty

are concerned. It provides for a final vote upon a certain resolution of ratification which has been assented to already by sufficient Senators, so that there is no reasonable chance of materially changing it. If we accepted that proposition we would be in the position of agreeing to vote upon the resolution of ratification as practically already framed by the Senator from Massachusetts and certain of his colleagues, without any power materially to alter that resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Neither this unanimous-consent agreement nor, I think, any unanimous-consent agreement that will be offered, could or would cut off in any way the right to amend or substitute another reservation for any reservation offered. They would all be open to substitution, to amendment, to change, as they were passed, one by one. Of course, the final vote would be on the resolution of ratification in such form as the Senate had agreed upon. That is all the agreement calls for.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, suppose that resolution should fail to receive a two-thirds vote?

Mr. LODGE. Then, of course, as the uniform practice of the Senate shows, it will be open for a motion of reconsideration.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator, then, would construe the rule and the Constitution to mean that no different resolution of ratification could then be proposed.

Mr. LODGE. No different one could be proposed at the same time we were working on the first one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Suppose that one had been defeated, having failed to receive a two-thirds majority vote?

Mr. LODGE. Then, if there was a majority of the Senate that desired to reconsider it, it could be reconsidered and another set of reservations undoubtedly would be offered, I suppose.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But except by reconsideration?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know what the parliamentary situation would then be. I can not tell what action would have been taken.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then it is exactly that contingency which we can not afford to consent to. We can not agree that the final vote on the treaty should be had upon a resolution of ratification made up to a large extent by the enemies of the treaty. If the resolution conducted by the Senator from Massachusetts fails to receive a two-thirds vote, we want the opportunity to present another resolution of ratification which may ultimately receive a two-thirds vote, which may receive the vote of the Senators who desire to ratify the treaty without reservations, who may compromise with Senators who desire to ratify the treaty with reservations. We are not willing by unanimous consent to agree that the final vote on the treaty shall be the proposition to pass the resolution framed very largely by those who are the enemies of the treaty.

Mr. President, in taking this position we feel that we are more than justified by the spirit of the Constitution. The Constitution provides that the matter of ratification of a treaty shall be in the hands of two-thirds of the Senate, not in the hands of a majority of the Senate.

The Constitution provides that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting shall be required to assent to the ratification of the treaty, and the rules of the Senate provide that a two-thirds vote is necessary indefinitely to postpone the treaty. It is two-thirds of the Senate and not a bare majority that are entitled to control the vote on this treaty.

Mr. President, I want to say right here that, in my opinion, the treaty will remain before the Senate until the Senate takes definite action upon it. You can postpone it indefinitely by a two-thirds vote, and that will end it for the present so far as the Senate is concerned; you can recommit it to the Committee on Foreign Relations by a majority vote if you want to take that responsibility; the Senate also can displace it by a majority vote by agreeing to a resolution to take up some other measure; but certainly we are entitled to have definite action taken by the Senate, to have Senators assume the responsibility either of indefinite postponement or recommitment or of displacing the treaty by another measure. We are not willing to have the treaty smothered by a bare majority, who have agreed upon a certain resolution of ratification with qualifications that some of us are not able to accept. We feel that we are entitled to have a sincere effort made to see whether it is possible to secure 64 votes here in the Senate for the treaty.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TOWNSEND. How does the Senator expect that we shall arrive at a conclusion by the Senate as to what the treaty shall be and when the resolution of ratification shall be adopted except by a majority vote as we proceed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think that is a fair question, and I will explain to the Senator what I think would be the fair, broad-minded way by which every effort could be made to test the real sentiment of the Senate. I believe that can be brought about only, first, by permitting the resolution of ratification as drawn very largely in the Committee on Foreign Relations, modified possibly to some extent here as in Committee of the Whole, to come to a vote. When that vote has been taken, if the resolution receives a two-thirds majority, there is nothing to do except to notify the President that that has been done. If it fails in that form to receive a two-thirds majority, then, there being here in the Senate probably 70 Senators who want the treaty in some form, it certainly seems to me to be the fair thing to permit some of those Senators to present for a vote of the Senate a resolution in such form as they think will receive the assent of a larger number of Senators.

In case the resolution of ratification offered by the Senator from Massachusetts shall fail to receive a two-thirds vote, I believe the next step should be to submit to the Senate a resolution of unqualified ratification, without any provisos or conditions. If that shall fail to receive the necessary two-thirds vote, the fair thing would be to allow Senators to present other resolutions of ratification qualified in such a way as they might receive a larger number of votes; and possibly reach a settlement in that way. If such resolutions fail to receive a two-thirds vote, then it is up to the Senate to decide what to do with the treaty. We shall then have tested out in a fair, broad way the sentiment of the Senate.

I am not sure that ratification will be reached in any form; but if Senators desire that the matter now be handled in a way which the magnitude and dignity of the great question require instead of by the methods of a political convention, in which a bare majority binds itself to stand by a certain resolution and if that resolution fails the whole thing fails, I think the method which I have suggested would be much more in accordance with the dignity and importance of this great question and would settle it.

There is no settlement of the question if the Senate is confined merely to a vote upon the proposition presented by the Senator from Massachusetts, backed probably by a bare majority. It simply shows what a majority will do. It neither indefinitely postpones the treaty nor does it supplant it by anything else. The method which I propose would bring about a settlement.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall object to the request for unanimous consent presented by the Senator from Massachusetts, and, in place of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which I presented to the Senate on Friday last, I offer another suggestion for a unanimous-consent agreement. If the Senate will permit, I shall read it, as it is not in printed form, and shall read it slowly, so that it may be fairly understood:

First. That after the adoption of this unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will meet each day at 11 o'clock a. m. for the consideration of the German treaty and all amendments, reservations, or resolutions of ratification that may be proposed. No Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes during the present week upon any pending question.

Second. That during the calendar day of Monday, November 3, 1919, before adjournment or recess, the Senate will vote upon the pending amendment and also upon any other amendments to the treaty that may be offered.

Third. That during the calendar days of Tuesday and Wednesday, November 4 and 5, 1919, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, will consider committee reservations, which consideration may be continued not later than the calendar day of Thursday, November 6, 1919, at 3 o'clock p. m., before or at which time a vote upon pending committee reservations shall be taken, whereupon the treaty shall be reported to the Senate by the Committee of the Whole.

Fourth. In the Senate the vote upon the resolution of ratification, embracing such reservations as have been adopted in Committee of the Whole, shall take place before adjournment or recess of the calendar day of Thursday, November 6, 1919.

Fifth. If it receives the necessary two-thirds vote, the President shall be notified.

Sixth. If it does not receive the necessary two-thirds vote, the Senate shall consider on Friday, November 7, and Saturday, November 8, 1919, any resolutions of ratification proposed by the minority of the Foreign Relations Committee and vote upon the same not later than 3 o'clock p. m., Saturday, November 8, 1919. If no such resolution receives the necessary two-thirds vote, it shall then be in order for any Senator to propose a resolution of ratification during the calendar day and the same shall be voted upon without discussion. If no such resolution receives the necessary two-thirds vote, it shall thereupon be in order for any Senator to move to take up the railroad bill or any other business, and this question shall be decided without discussion.

Mr. President, that provides for bringing the matter to a head this week. It puts the Senate in a position where on next Saturday, by a mere majority vote, if no resolution of ratification

has been accepted, it can set aside the treaty for the present and take up the railroad bill or any other important legislation. It distributes fairly well the time on the reservations and on the pending amendment, giving, of course, the lion's share of time to the reservations proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations as they may be modified as in Committee of the Whole. If two-thirds of the Senate do not agree to the resolution of ratification which the Senator from Massachusetts fathers, it then gives the other sentiment in the Senate an opportunity to present its case to the Senate and ask for a vote, first, probably upon an unqualified resolution of ratification; and if that shall be defeated, then upon another resolution of ratification with such qualifications and restrictions and reservations as may be necessary to unite 64 votes in the Senate in the support of the resolution.

I think that is a fair proposition. It will, I repeat, bring the matter to an end this week. It will have the effect of giving the best possible opportunity to test out the sentiment of the Senate on the subject of ratification. It does away with the idea that a mere majority can tie up a resolution here and say to the remainder of the Senate, "If you do not approve this, the treaty is at an end." The very idea of reservations is to give an opportunity for a compromise of diverse opinions.

Mr. President, there is a very honest difference of opinion as to the terms on which this treaty should be ratified. The time has come when we have got to look the situation fairly in the face, and we find that unless a compromise between these diverse views is reached the treaty can not be ratified, but it places the responsibility where it belongs.

There is another thing that it does. It gives to the Senators here who believe in the treaty in some form an opportunity to reach a compromise. As it is, it is well known that the pending resolution of ratification, with the reservations already agreed to, represents particularly the views of Senators who are going to vote against the treaty even when those reservations are attached to it. It does not represent the Senators here who want to ratify the treaty; and, while it is perfectly proper for them to inject their views into the resolution of ratification, it is not fair play to prevent Senators from voting on another resolution of ratification.

Senators may say that we can amend the resolution of ratification fathered by the Senator from Massachusetts; but the Senator from Massachusetts has assured me, and other Senators associated with him have assured me, that they have the vote to hold it right where it is; they have the pledges of Senators to stand by that resolution. Very well; let that resolution come to a vote in the Senate. If it can muster a two-thirds vote, the treaty is entitled to ratification in that form; but if it can not muster a two-thirds vote, certainly we ought to have the opportunity to present a resolution in a different form, and we should not adopt the methods of a political convention in preventing a fair expression of the average opinion of the Senators here in the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, for the consideration of the Senate, I offer the request for unanimous consent which I have read.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the only methods that I have adopted are the methods laid down by the rules and by the practice of the Senate of the United States in dealing with treaties. Let me first draw a distinction, which the Senator from Nebraska omitted to draw but which is vital, between the resolution of ratification and the reservations or conditions which are attached to it. The resolution of ratification is the enacting clause, and, of course, is the same in all cases, whether it stops with simple consent and advice or whether it goes on and imposes conditions. The Senator would have to use it for his reservations if he proposes to attach any to the treaty; he would have to use it if he proposes to ratify the treaty without reservation. That is the resolution of ratification. The reservations are what are in discussion here.

It is true that the Constitution gave to one-third of the Senate, or one more than one-third, power to defeat a treaty; but it did not give them control of the reservations or amendments, or of the form in which the treaty should go to the question of ratification. That is left to a majority. The Senator's proposition is that the majority must not have its way; that the people who are to decide must be the one more than one-third; and, of course, they can have their way as to whether the treaty shall be ratified or not, no matter what form it may take.

Now, Mr. President, we consider the reservations. As I have said, they are open to every form of amendment and substitution. Each will be considered separately. They will then be taken into the Senate, and again they will be open to a separate vote on each one, and to any amendment, and to any substitution. Then the reservations or amendments, if there should be any, agreed upon by the Senate in Committee of the Whole and in

the Senate, are placed upon the enacting clause, which is then put at the head of them, and that is submitted to the Senate for a final vote as to whether the resolution in that form shall pass. There has been every opportunity to do everything that the Senator wishes to have done. If the resolution fails in that form to receive the vote of two-thirds of the Senate, it is then open to reconsideration if a majority favors reconsideration, and it can be brought back here as it stands, with the reservations or amendments, if there are any, attached to it; and the Senate then has an opportunity, and the minority who have voted against ratification have the opportunity, to deal with it under the rules.

Mr. President, those are the parliamentary methods and the methods pursued by the Senate in all cases where treaties have had reservations, or where they have been proposed, or where there has been rejection of a resolution and subsequent reconsideration. I see no reason to go beyond those rules. I do not believe for a moment that it is possible under parliamentary law to take a resolution of any sort, or a bill, and lay one form after another beside it, and keep voting on indefinite propositions. The whole basis of parliamentary law is to promote the transaction of business with a view of bringing it to a conclusion. Now, it is not a final conclusion, of course, but the first conclusion we can reach is on an enacting resolution with such amendments or reservations as the Senate chooses to put on. That is the first step toward final action. I think that action ought to be taken. I should be glad to take it on the 6th, or the 10th, or any date that the Senate may decide; but I am not going into any elaborate piecemeal scheme of this sort. I want to get some kind of definite action, and have the resolution of ratification either carried or lost. Then, if reconsideration is desired, whenever the majority chooses to take it up, it can bring up the resolution again and try it once more; but I am not going to vote for a lot of piecemeal agreements. I want to get a vote on the resolution with the reservations that the Senate sees fit to adopt now, after full consideration; and I shall object to any other form that does not carry with it a definite time for voting on a resolution of ratification in such form as the Senate chooses to make it. I think this other agreement, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, produces no end at all. The country wants this treaty either voted up or voted down.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there were Senators on the other side of the Chamber and Senators on this side of the Chamber who have been designated as "mild reservationists." They held quite different views from the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee. They were antagonistic to many of the reservations presented by the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee. I understand, however, that they have agreed to vote for those reservations under the belief that only by voting for such reservations may a sufficient number of votes be commanded to get any action at all. For that reason, and for that reason only, they will vote for these reservations. If these reservations are adopted as a part of the resolution of ratification by a majority vote, and if then they do not succeed in accomplishing the ratification of the treaty by the necessary two-thirds vote, those mild reservationists are not going to stop there if they have a legal opportunity to go further. They will have satisfied their obligations to the majority on the other side of the Chamber; they will have voted with the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the resolution of ratification will have failed in that form. Will it not then be the desire of the mild reservationists on that side of the Chamber to offer a reservation which will possibly appeal to two-thirds of this body? If the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts goes through, there will be no such opportunity to the mild reservationists on that side of the Chamber or on this side of the Chamber.

In other words, there are Senators on this side of the Chamber who do not believe in any reservations. Those Senators probably will vote against all reservations; and yet, as one of those very Senators who would vote against all reservations, I would not like to be foreclosed from the privilege of voting for interpretative reservations if it turned out to be the only way in which the treaty could be ratified. Yet if the plan of the Senator from Massachusetts is adopted, I will vote against such reservations and I will vote against the resolution of ratification containing those reservations, and if there are a third of this body voting the same way that I do the resolution will be defeated, and that is to be the end of the treaty under the plan submitted. If it is demonstrated that that resolution was defeated by reason of the character of the reservations in it, and I am convinced that we can not ratify the treaty without reservations, and the Senator from North Dakota should then offer his reservations or some other Senator should offer his interpretative reservations, I would feel justified then in joining those Senators in voting for

a compromise resolution. I would be debarred of this opportunity under Senator LODGE's plan. It could be accomplished under Senator HITCHCOCK's plan.

There is not any chance on earth, and the Senator from Massachusetts knows it, of ever ratifying this treaty with the reservations that he now presents to the Senate. I do not think he has in his mind for one moment that he can get two-thirds of the Senate to vote for the resolution of ratification containing those reservations, and yet he seeks to force a final vote upon the treaty upon the vote upon those reservations. He wants to prevent the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Georgia from offering interpretative reservations that may command the votes of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. He does not desire to give the Senators on this side who will first vote against all reservations another chance to vote for mild reservations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I could not possibly cut off Senators from offering any reservations they wanted to, even if I desired to do so, and I have no such desire.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator has said that, but it does not meet the point. They can offer substitutes or amendments before the vote on the resolution submitted by the Senator. They can do it beforehand, but they can not do it afterwards. That is exactly the distinction I am making.

Mr. LODGE. They can not offer them after the resolution is agreed to, can they?

Mr. PITTMAN. Nor can they offer any other resolution, under the plan proposed by the Senator, after his is defeated.

Mr. LODGE. Why, certainly, they can.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is exactly the position the Senator is trying to put us in.

Mr. LODGE. They can move reconsideration, bring it back, and consider it all over again, if they want to.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator is trying to deprive the Senators in this body who desire the treaty ratified as it is of any opportunity to compromise after his resolution of ratification is defeated. That is the purpose of it, and that will be the accomplishment of it, if the Senator succeeds. He desires us to vote our honest convictions now, with no opportunity, after the resolution is defeated, to enter into a compromise with any other Senators in this body. That is the whole purpose of it. That will be the result of it.

Mr. LODGE. I am proceeding simply according to the rules. I know no other way. I can not change the rules in the middle of the game, as seems to be proposed. I am following the rules as they stand. There will be every opportunity for everybody to offer any compromise or other reservations that they want to. There is no other way of getting at it that I know of. All I want to do is to get a vote; and if these reservations that I propose are beaten, and a majority does not vote for them, then we can come to a vote on the treaty without reservations or with other reservations; but let us get a vote. That is what I want.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is true the Senator wants a vote, but he wants a vote in a manner that is certain to defeat this treaty. He says that we may offer our amendments to his resolution. Yes; that is true; but he knows that those amendments will be defeated. The Senator from North Dakota could offer his substitute reservations, but he knows that they will be defeated. He knows that everything is tied up for the defeat of anything that might accomplish a compromise in this body, and then he wants to force before this body on a final vote something that he knows will defeat the treaty. That is the purpose of it. He says he is simply following the rules. Why, the Senator knows that by unanimous consent you can set aside any rule, and that is exactly what the Senator from Nebraska has asked the Senator to do. He has asked him to set aside the rules so that after the vote is taken upon the Senator's resolution, if it does not get the necessary two-thirds, we may take a vote on a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, and then, if that does not get the necessary two-thirds, we can vote on a resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota. That is what he asks. Those rules can be changed by unanimous consent, and the Senator need not worry about that if he is simply trying to accomplish action.

Mr. LODGE. The rules can not be changed by unanimous consent, and will not be, of course. I have no reason to know that the treaty with these reservations attached, or the important ones among them attached, will not be ratified. On the contrary, I have always believed that it would be.

I have tried to bring about reservations which would lead to the ratification of the treaty. If they are voted down, and voted down by those who profess to be the friends of the treaty,

no matter what rule you have, or what rule you abolish, you can not abolish the Constitution, and the treaty will be in great danger.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am taking no part in the form of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I am, however, very deeply interested in a subject which will be vitally affected by the arrangement that is proposed. I am for any sort of unanimous-consent agreement that will dispose finally of the treaty during the present week.

I bring to the attention of Senators a situation which is so grave that it ought to be uppermost in our minds when we are considering at what time the present subject shall be disposed of. Nine months ago, substantially, the President of the United States declared that not later than the 1st of January now approaching he would feel it his duty to return the railways of the country to their owners, under a power which he undoubtedly possesses. I have good reason to believe that his purpose at that time has not been changed. I can not speak positively with regard to his intent, but I am led to think that about the first of the approaching January these properties will be returned to their owners. Nor could anyone criticize the President with much severity, because we have had ample opportunity to prepare and enact into law the legislation which I regard as absolutely necessary in the return of our systems of transportation to their owners.

I do not criticize anybody for the time taken in the debate upon the treaty. It is of the mightiest consequence. I have never uttered a word of complaint with regard to it. But I think it has been debated sufficiently. I know that every Senator has made up his mind with regard to the votes which he shall cast, either upon the proposed amendments or reservations, or upon the ratification. In view of the impending calamity—and it will be a calamity from which we can not escape, if the railroads are returned to their owners without adequate and sufficient legislation—in view of that situation, the German treaty ought to be disposed of, and I have not ventured to think, even, that the consideration of it could be, or would be, prolonged beyond the present week.

If the railroads are returned to their owners without adequate legislation, you will not only see an intensification of all of the difficulties which are now observed in the labor world, but, in my judgment, you will witness a financial catastrophe against which it will be very hard for us to contend. It is our bounden duty, if it be within our possibilities, to pass before this session ends the legislation which we think is necessary to properly take care of the situation; and I, for one, would feel that I had done less than my duty if I did not use all of the means at my command to induce the Senate to take up this subject for consideration within a very brief time.

I have not attempted to bring it forward, because I have believed that we ought to dispose of the German treaty; but we have reached now a situation, and I want fairly to advise Senators, in which I shall feel it to be my responsibility and my duty to ask that the German treaty be displaced, if I can not be assured in some manner that the railroads will not be returned to their owners in the absence of adequate and protective legislation.

I do not know just when I ought to do that. I have been waiting day after day, hoping that the debate upon the treaty might be brought to a conclusion. But so seriously do I view the subject of what are the consequences of passing over into the next year without legislation on this subject that if it becomes apparent that the German treaty is to be delayed, and is to claim the attention of the Senate during all of this session and part of the next, I shall have no doubt with regard to my duty in the premises.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. JONES of Washington addressed the Chair.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I only want to say that I entirely appreciate the feeling of the Senator from Iowa. I sympathize with him. I shall be glad to see the resolution of ratification with reservations voted on upon Saturday next, if I can bring it about.

That at least would make procedure along parliamentary lines and it would take one long step to finish it; but I can not agree to a unanimous-consent request that leaves this thing open to indefinite postponement and talk of compromise, trying to arrange here and there, behind the doors and in the cloak-rooms, a compromise which will consume more time than has been already consumed. I shall object to that form of agreement.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was not in the least criticizing the position of the Senator from Massachusetts. He has told me for the last several weeks that he desired to do everything in his

power to bring the debate to a close, and I know that that has been his purpose. I do not want to leave the German treaty until it is finally disposed of. I am entirely in sympathy with that view.

I do not quite comprehend the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]; but whatever is done, no matter what course is pursued, let us agree upon something that will dispose of this treaty, so far as its consideration by the Senate is concerned, within this week, if that be possible. If there are Senators who think that the debate ought to be continued, and that it can not be disposed of in justice to its great importance until the next session, then let us lay it aside and take up for consideration a subject that must be disposed of if we are to protect the people of this country in their transportation facilities before the first of the year. Now I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would like to see the treaty disposed of soon. I am ready to vote at any time. I understand, I think, the importance of the railroad legislation; but I want to ask the Senator if there is any law requiring the Railroad Administration to turn the railroads back to private parties by the 1st of January?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no such law. The President has the power to return them; and I venture to suggest that while, if I were in his stead, I would not return them until adequate legislation is enacted, yet there are a great many reasons which move one in that direction. At this time there is almost complete demoralization in the railway service. The employees, knowing that the time is approaching for the return of the properties to their former owners, can not maintain that degree of efficiency which ought to be manifest in all such service. The railway companies are utterly incapable of doing anything, for they have nothing with which to accomplish any purpose. The properties are not in their possession; the working capital is not in their possession; they are unable even to prepare fairly for the approaching return of the properties. There is every consideration for the rapid disposition of the subject, and we can not vindicate ourselves to the people of the country unless we do take such measures as are necessary and adequate to accomplish the purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to get the opinion of the Senator as to the amount of time which will probably be consumed in the consideration of his railroad bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not attempted to make an estimate along that line, but it has seemed to me that the Senate ought to be able to dispose of it within three weeks.

Mr. THOMAS. What the Senate ought to be able to do and what it does in actual practice are divergent things.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not disposed to deny that.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator if he has the impression that if we should take up the railroad bill next week we could dispose of it before the holidays?

Mr. CUMMINS. If we should take up the railroad bill next Monday, I think we could dispose of it by the end of November.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not so optimistic as that, by any means; but I am willing to try it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I want to try it.

Mr. THOMAS. I will aid the Senator all I can by keeping as quiet as possible during the interval, if that will help any. I suggest to the Senator that he make the railroad bill the unfinished business, and we can then devote to it the morning hour when we adjourn instead of recessing, and by that means we will make a little progress. In any event, we will create some diversion for the galleries by relieving them of the monotony of treaty consideration.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am sure the railroad question will not furnish the charming and delightful forays into the history of the world that we have witnessed in the treaty debate. I think that when we take it up for consideration the galleries will empty pretty rapidly. But however that may be, all I want is that Senators, in coming to a conclusion with regard to what kind of an agreement should be made to bring the German treaty to an end, will have in mind the situation which confronts us so far as our railways are concerned. I am willing to agree to anything so far as the distribution of time and length of debate are concerned that will bring the consideration of the treaty to an end this week; and when it is brought to an end it ought to be at an end for the time being, at any rate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether the unanimous-consent agreement submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was objected to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to make a formal objection to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I so understood. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, what I desire to say will be in the line of the regular order, and I want to address a question to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

I should very much like to have adopted the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Nebraska. I appreciate the fact that it is very difficult to make an arrangement whereby a minority may have a second chance if they fail to secure their wish on the first opportunity. Inasmuch as under the regular rules of the Senate there is only one way of registering the opinion of a minority, and that is by a vote upon each proposition as it comes up, as an amendment, and a final vote either on accepting the result or voting against the proposition as it comes before the Senate at that time, and as we can not make the change then, I know of no way under the rule whereby the minority can get another opportunity to register its views in another manner unless we have unanimous consent.

Now, I am satisfied that there are those who are so bitterly opposed to the treaty that they will never give unanimous consent to anything that would take from them any advantage they may have. Therefore I think it is useless for the Senator or anyone else to attempt to secure an agreement which would allow the Senate to vote upon the reservations, or the resolution containing reservations, and, if they are defeated and if they can not get a reconsideration of that vote, then to have unanimous consent that they could try the whole matter over; and that is really what the unanimous-consent request of the Senator means.

If that is an impossibility, if we have got to meet this issue, it seems to me we might just as well meet it at one time as another in agreeing upon a day certain, and if we can not, by any possibility, change the proposed reservations to suit us, then the question will have to be put up to the Senate whether they wish to vote for or against those reservations as they shall appear in the resolution at that time. I am ready to meet it.

I think there is a little error about the unanimity of understanding concerning the reservations that have been printed. The first four or five of them I shall support. I shall support them because I feel confident that we can not get 64 votes for the treaty unless we have them, and that is the only reason that guides me in supporting them. If I should vote for the resolution of ratification as it is finally formulated, and that resolution should fail to receive the 64 votes necessary, I have enough interest in the treaty, and hope that upon a reconsideration it might be modified so that we could get the vote, to move of my own volition to reconsider the vote by which it passed. But I recognize the fact that a majority can vote that down, and I do not know of any way to escape it.

I am not in favor of every one of the reservations. I am opposed to the preamble or a portion of the preamble to the reservations, and I am opposed to one or two of the reservations, and so I notified my colleagues when they passed upon them in the committee that I would reserve the right to oppose them in the Senate.

So after all it seems to me that we might as well agree first as last upon a date, if we are going to attempt to get the treaty disposed of in a reasonable time, for I am certain that those who are opposed to the treaty in any form will not consent to give the Senator from Nebraska the advantage which he hopes for.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that while I was off the floor for a moment some question was raised about my making objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I did make objection or intended to make objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Massachusetts had objected, and so stated.

Mr. FERNALD obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Maine if he will give way to me for a few remarks connected with a matter which has been under consideration?

Mr. FERNALD. I have been waiting for some little time to proceed. I should like to go on at this time if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I offer no apology for the action I am about to take toward the solution of the great question now before this Senate. For weeks a fair and open discussion has taken place by those who earnestly favor the league of nations and the treaty of peace. It has been my desire from the beginning to endeavor in every way possible so to perfect this document that it might meet my passive approval. I have never ardently espoused the cause of the league of nations, for I see in it many provisions which I deem dangerous to the liberties of a free people, and especially to the liberties of our own Republic. The President of the United States, with his ad-

visers, spent weeks in foreign lands in a company of statesmen and representatives of other and foreign governments in coming to an agreement and what he deemed a just solution of the matter. I do not question his sincerity and realize the difficulty under which he labored in the meeting of so many diversified minds and opinions.

Doubtless in the circumstances he did the best he could. If I were to criticize his action at all it would be in his selection of delegates to represent this country abroad on a matter of such vital interest to our people. Had he taken men even from his own party altogether, or such as might be found on either side of this Chamber, I believe that a document might have been produced which in every respect would be more acceptable to this Senate and to the American people than that which we now have before us. This, however, is a question of the past, and criticism at this time is, perhaps, out of order, quite futile, and unnecessary.

But this treaty or contract between nations is before us with a statement from the administration that should any changes of a material nature be made the force of the entire document would be annulled. I can not agree, Mr. President, to this view. I believe that the wisdom of this Senate may be relied upon to make some changes which would bring this within the approval of those who must ratify it before it can be enforced. I shall not attempt in detail to discuss all of the many articles of the treaty, because they have already been discussed by the Members of the Senate, and the very fact that this body is fairly evenly divided in the matter proves beyond cavil that some changes must be made before we can come to an agreement and ratify the treaty.

I do not intend to thrash over old straw, because it would seem that every kernel of wheat has been taken from it. Senators on both sides of the Chamber has agreed that many of the treaty provisions are not only unfair, unreasonable, and unjust, but entirely illegal and unconstitutional. I do not, of course, offer any suggestions along legal or constitutional lines. The Senate has already been enlightened on both sides of the question by able constitutional lawyers. It is in a spirit of fairness and entirely from a business man's standpoint that I shall attempt to discuss these matters. But in doing so I do not feel that I must make any observations to excuse any vote I may take or to place myself properly before my constituents. The people of my State—like those, I assume, of other States—are not of one opinion, and disagree as to the action they would like me and my colleague to take. It is a matter of some regret to me that I must oppose my colleague in this matter. He and I do not agree entirely in the method of solving this question, and I concede to him the same right to his opinion that I claim for my own. In our discussions there will be no resentment or feeling of disregard on my part, and I am sure he shares the same feeling. He represents, I assume, the sentiment of many honest, well-meaning, intelligent people of our State. Just how our constituents would divide on this matter I am unable to say; but I do feel that the position I take on this question will meet the approval of some at least—and I trust of many—of the business men not only of my own State but of the entire country.

I do not even share the belief that great speed should be made in the solution of this matter. I have felt entirely satisfied with the progress we have made and with the leadership of both eminent Senators on each side of the Chamber. I want to say here and now that the people of this country, even though they desire prompt and speedy action on most matters, feel that in this particular case, where we are about to enter into a contract with the nations of the world that is not temporary but enduring, it is far better that careful deliberation be given than that any hasty action be taken. I, of course, desire to expedite this discussion and the consideration as much as is consistent with its scope and magnitude and the far-reaching effect of its solution in its relation to our people. Many Senators have already expressed themselves on this question; and I am quite willing to wait in patience in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to make such observations as they may see fit, and that all such shall have due and just consideration. I hold that in the final disposition of this matter no partisan spirit will be shown, because the settlement of this great question is far above partisanship or any political aggrandizement. It is an American question and should be settled by Americans in an American way.

Before discussing the merits or demerits of amendments or reservations to be made to this treaty I want to say that I do not deem it such a holy and sanctified instrument as some Members of the Senate would have it appear.

Nor do I believe it necessary that any provisions be made whereby the treaty may not be sent back for further consideration by the Governments interested and the signatories to the

document. While I have very tender compassion for the sentiments of other people, I have a much greater regard for the feelings of my own countrymen. And if it seem necessary in making the changes that this document be returned to the signers for consideration, I shall vote to send it back to them with a much greater respect for my own judgment than to have either mild or stringent reservations made that would insure its adoption. I have not opposed—in fact, I am very much in favor of—amendments that shall be made in the body of the document. I believe in meeting these matters squarely and fairly, and that every signatory should understand well and without question just the position this Government is taking in making this treaty. I do not agree with those who think that reservations will be passed without consideration. Every act of this Senate and every word in any reservation will be as carefully scanned by the other powers as if amendments were made. I have preferred amendments rather than reservations.

But there are those who think that by making such reservation as they deem will protect the interests of our Government it will not be necessary to have further consideration, and that the powers of the earth will accept it without further controversy. And that seems the only excuse given by those who advocate reservations in the place of amendments. If we are to make a contract with a party, why not embody in that contract every act that we intend to perform, have it well understood, that there may be no controversy in the future regarding it? In fact, I believe that some provisions that I desire can not be made by reservation, but that it will be necessary to have amendments before the contract will meet with my approval. I may stand alone in this, but if I do, it is my constitutional right; and I would rather stand alone and feel that I am right and justified in my stand than to accept that which I deem unwise, unfair, unjust, unrighteous, and dangerous to American interests and institutions.

In the ratification of the instrument before us we are departing from the policies laid down by the founders of the Government and the makers of the Constitution and those early founders of the Republic who, looking down through the ages, never dreamed of such entangling alliances as this document stipulates. Coming fresh from the different Governments where they had been under the dominion of monarchs, and suffering from the autocracy and the environments under which they had lived, they advised against such alliances. As has been so often referred to in this Chamber, Washington, in his parting address and in the inspired words, almost of a prophet, warned us against the very doctrines which are embodied in this treaty. Every one of the statesmen of that day, knowing full well the desire of the great governments of the earth to court our friendship and engage our assistance, made plain in the most convincing language the danger of such alliances. For 130 years we have followed the teachings of our fathers, and in that time the Old World has been honeycombed with intrigues, revolutions, uprisings, and wars. But this Republic, standing alone, going straight forward in the course laid down by the founders, has kept its bearings, grown in national wealth and prosperity, and to-day we present a country that is the wonder and the admiration of the world.

It is a matter of gratifying pride to me to know that whenever our Government has been threatened by foreign aggression the North and South, the East and the West, have sprung to arms and have been ready as one man to come to the rescue. It matters not how humble a citizen of this country, if he has sworn allegiance to the flag, whether he be black or white, red or yellow, poor or rich, as a citizen of this country, he may feel an absolute security under the flag and in the power and majesty of its protection.

This country has never made an aggressive war; it is only when our property and lives have been in danger or taken that we have offered resentment. I can not agree with those who claim that the war with Germany was solely for the "safety of democracy"; I voted to declare war on Germany because she had destroyed our property, insulted our flag, murdered our citizens, sent our men and women to the bottom of the sea. And it is in such cases only that our Government will rise to arms and resort to force. But when that occasion arises, we have in this great Republic of ours sons whom America can depend upon to defend the flag; and no nobler men nor more vigorous fighters can be found on the face of the earth.

We have no great standing Army. Our Navy has not been the largest in the world. But when it comes to heroism and courage, that nation is yet unborn which can stand before our soldiers in open honorable battle. And we need not fear a coalition of the nations of the earth to destroy the United States, because all the powers combined of hell and earth can not, on our own soil, meet us with any expectancy of victory.

I make this not as a challenge, because I desire peace at all times, but simply to assure those who are fearful of what may come to us in the event that this league of nations is not ratified. And our boys are ready at a moment's call. They may drill with broomsticks, they may be called upon untrained and unequipped, but when Uncle Sam gives the word they are ready to spring to action, and will never be found wanting. They are not ready to obey the command of some foreign potentate. And if this league of nations is accepted, the mothers who gave so nobly their heroic sons in defense of their country will again be called to make the sacrifice, because as sure as the sun rises and sets we will be forced to send our soldiers to every field of battle on the face of the globe where war is imminent.

And in these days when we are supposed to be at peace, and as a Nation are at peace, there are scores of little wars going on in the distant and far-off countries of the Old World. In Siberia—in fact, in almost every quarter of Asia—little armies to-day are fighting and men are dying, and this league contemplates sending our men to quell every outburst or uprising. If this be not its intention, why does the administration suggest that we support an army of 500,000 men and spend millions in construction of battleships and in training our soldiers? What else are armies and navies expected to do but to fight? The very fact that they have asked for large appropriations for this purpose proves beyond a question of doubt that we are expected to enter these conflicts. And those well-meaning people, those churches, who have resolved that this treaty should be ratified without a change believe that the league of nations to enforce peace will stop all further war. Oh, what a delirious, Utopian dream! How I wish that it would accomplish this. But it is certain to do just the opposite. When we enter into a contract to protect the territorial integrity of other nations, no matter what the conditions may be, no matter how much a people may desire liberty and freedom, we must aid the government with whom we are in alliance and to whom we have promised assistance.

Recently in this body soldiers of Irish birth have been ridiculously maligned—these people who for years have had the desire for liberty; these people who have been under the English yoke and have striven for liberty and have made the most righteous demands; these people who stood beside the patriots in this country during the Revolution and in the War of 1812. I can not conscientiously vote for the ratification of the covenant so long as it does not make proper provision and give assurance to the Irish people which my sense of right demands. No assurance is given which indicates that the league can settle the problems of this people striving for self-determination and who may and probably will demand recognition in the future. I want such provision incorporated in the document.

This covenant in its present form pledges members of the league to the aid of other members; hence, in the event of Ireland's striving to wrest her freedom from England, the United States would be unable to aid her and must support Great Britain, the latter being a member of the league. Regardless of how much our sympathies might be with Ireland, no matter how dear the cause of Ireland to the 20,000,000 Americans of Irish blood in this country, under this treaty we should be forced to aid Great Britain, and this despite the fact that this Senate, by a vote of 60 to 1, adopted the resolution asking for a hearing as to the situation of affairs in Ireland. This hearing was denied at Paris, and the same influences that refused the hearing will be at work in the council of the league.

In passing let me say that I wish to register my regret for and my disapproval of the reckless assertion regarding the aid rendered by the Irish in the Revolutionary War. Historians have proven to us that 38 per cent of the Revolutionary Army was Irish, and we know that the Civil War furnished its full quota of Irish soldiers, and no one need be told that in the World War the Irish name was conspicuous and Irish courage unquestioned.

And for the part which the Irish race has taken in the solution of these great questions, in their loyalty and patriotism, their indomitable courage and their allegiance to the flag of their adoption, we owe them a debt of gratitude that can not be overestimated. I will never vote to ratify any document that will withhold from America the privilege of at least extending to this splendid race its moral and sympathetic support.

I have voted for every amendment which would, in my judgment, make this document less objectionable.

To my mind the situation regarding Shantung is a disgrace and a crime. America has ever stood for equal, economic opportunity for China and for her territorial integrity and independence as a nation. The attitude of the United States in this respect has been above reproach, and I can not bear to think

that the American people will stand for injustice or will willingly sanction or permit it. I want America to keep her record unblemished and unstained. But if the control of Shantung is permitted to be given Japan, that record, in my eyes, will be blemished and our standard lowered. China is one of the richest countries on the face of the earth. She is the source of immense supply for minerals, including iron, copper, coal, silver, and gold. She is a still greater reservoir of men. Her population is estimated at 300,000,000. Added to this are her endowments of favorable climate and unsurpassed fertility of soil. Naturally enough, in her weakness and civil strife and her condition of partially lost independence, China is a great temptation to a power of autocratic militarism like Japan, who more than any other nation is vitally interested in China's fate. Because of geographical propinquity Japan has a strong advantage and has come to feel a sort of claim to China. This ever-growing power over China is naturally productive of bad feeling between the two peoples. Hence, the Chinese detest the Japs and the Japs despise the Chinese and covet China's possession. This tension has been materially heightened by the Paris proceedings.

America's traditional policy has always been to preserve the independence of her neighbor and to aid the best element to achieve national regeneration, and to me it seems incredible that our country will depart from that policy and permit a weak but friendly nation, an ally in the recent war, to become the prey of a rival and ambitious power, and the possible cause of another world war. China is our sister Republic, as much as the suffering nations of Europe, and despite her ignorance and her weakness it is our duty to play our part in lending her aid and assistance. I for one can not vote to ratify the peace treaty without a strong and separate protest against the Shantung provision.

What, you say, no amendment can be offered and no provision made that will aid China or right the wrong perpetrated by Japan?

But unless some expression can be given to the sentiment of our people, which I am sure is almost unanimous, I am not willing to give this treaty my approval. I have voted for 40 amendments already, each in its turn to be defeated, and such, I assume, is to be the fate of every amendment, no matter how just or how much it might improve the covenant, because some with their tender mercy for other peoples can not permit such amendments to be made as will necessitate its return for consideration by other powers. Last week the Senator from California offered an amendment that would give to the United States equal representation in the league with Great Britain. There was no question. I assume, in the mind of anyone but that it was a just amendment, and to my mind it ought to have been accepted. I can not conceive of any citizen of our country refusing to vote to give our Government equal power with that of any other government on earth. From a standpoint of moral right and justice our Government, in my judgment, following a similar procedure to that employed in determining representation of other self-governing colonies, ought to have 48 votes—every State in this Union should be represented. To be sure, our States are not dominions nor colonies any more, but they are self-governing political bodies. We hold our elections for the governor and members of the legislature precisely as the Dominion of Canada holds her elections for the selection of Governor General and the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERNALD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. I wonder if the Senator has noticed the statement of a member of the Canadian House of Commons and for 16 years a member of the Canadian cabinet that New York is far more important to the Union than Canada to the British Empire.

Mr. FERNALD. I am going to take that up just a little later. I thank the Senator for the suggestion.

Mr. President, in every sense our States are self-governing political bodies, and are bound by the Union of States practically as Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and India are bound to the British Empire. We ought to have 48 votes in the league, both as a matter of right and to give some assurance that the questions which come up for consideration embracing almost every question in the world may be considered by the most intelligent, fair, and honorable body of citizens that may be found on the face of the globe. Some of our States are so much larger and are so much more in importance than the colonies which are represented by the 6 votes of Great Britain that there is no comparison. In fact, New York is much larger in population than the Dominion of Canada.

Her population of more than 10,000,000 represents the finest type of American citizenship. The Dominion of Canada has a population of 8,300,000, while little New Zealand has less than 1,000,000. The commerce of New York is equal to that of a hemisphere half a century ago, and last year the business, as represented by the imports and exports, was more than \$5,000,000,000, while that of New Zealand was \$250,000,000, which shows New York's business to be more than twenty times as great as that of New Zealand and twelve times the business done by South Africa, whose exports and imports were but \$400,000,000, and seven times that of Australia, whose exports and imports were but \$680,000,000; and yet New York has but one forty-eighth of the numerical strength in voting power in the league of nations that New Zealand has. Pennsylvania, with her population of 8,000,000, has no voting power of its own, except the one vote of the United States, as compared with Australia with a population of 4,120,000, exclusive of aborigines.

Think of Illinois, Ohio, and Texas, with a combined population of 13,000,000 souls, with their splendid institutions of learning, their great industrial centers, their marvelous resources, their fertile fields, their citizenship, as high as can be found under the sun, sitting passively by and permitting the colored representative of Liberia or Siam to cast his vote in the great question affecting the welfare and perpetuity of our Republic while they have no voice at all, not even in a "debating society." But some say this league has no authority to settle questions. It must be done by the council; that it is a mere "debating society"; that Great Britain gets no real benefit, but the mere satisfaction of having a few more representatives to put in their word whenever a question is debated. What folly! We have not a gambler's chance in this league. The cards are stacked against us. No sportsman would consider for a moment such a proposition. Can you conceive of Sir Thomas Lipton, the great English sportsman, challenging America to a yacht race, and after the contract had been entered into and the terms specifically stated announcing that as a consideration he would make a few mild reservations, and that among others he would understand that he was to have six men on his boat to every one that was on the American yacht, but that his men were not to touch a rope nor furl a sail, but simply to "stand around" and have nothing to do except to "say their say" in the event of any debate? Do you think American sportsmen would accept this "reservation" without question? This six-to-one proposition has been discussed so often in this Senate, and the Senate been given to understand that no advantage was to be had—that one equaled six, and so forth, a new mathematical philosophy that I do not understand—that I shall not undertake to discuss it. If six is no better than one, why did Premier Lloyd-George for hours and days insist that his dominions and colonies should each have a vote?

The very fact that Great Britain insisted upon this provision is sufficient evidence to prove to me that she expected some advantage to accrue to her from this unfair basis of representation; and having raised my hand to Heaven and sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, I swear by the Eternal that I never will submit to, and never will vote to ratify, a contract whereby my Government does not have equal power with that of any other government on this earth.

Other men may satisfy their conscience in permitting our Government to have a lesser representation in the councils of the world than Great Britain, but as for me nothing will satisfy my sense of patriotism but to give my Government at least an equal representation with that of any other. I place my Government and my flag above that of any other colony, government, or kingdom on the face of the earth, and on that issue I am willing to stand.

One word more on our representation in the league, and I am through with that feature of the question: In the dark days of the world conflict, when England was calling to America, and entreating her aid, she raised no question as to the numbers we should furnish in her defense. At that time she asked not that one American should equal six Britons, but her cry and supplication was for more munitions, more money, more ships, more food, and more men! And how America responded: She opened her treasures, she loaded ships with provisions, every farmer in the land rose to the occasion, and every available foot of soil in our whole country was cultivated and planted to supply the ever-increasing demand of the Allies. And our splendid boys paused not to reason why, but responded to the call of their country with a courage and heroism which has never been surpassed, crossing 3,000 miles of billows to meet the Teutons on foreign fields, and to raise the banner of the Republic across the seas, where it shall ever be honored by the nations of the world.

Ah no; there was then no suggestion that one equaled six, but we were given opportunity to furnish in that exigency our full quota.

Before proceeding to discuss the most menacing provision of the treaty I wish to mention a condition which may arise at any time. Suppose the bandits of Mexico should come across the border into the State of Texas, as they have done many times, confiscating property, murdering American citizens, and committing all the depredations of which the most miserable and lawless bandits could conceive. Do you think it likely that the Government of the United States would wait until the matter could be brought to the attention of the league of nations, acted upon by the council, and all of the many and varied constitutional questions settled before it would move in the matter? Such a thing is inconceivable. The United States Government, without a moment's delay, would send its armies to the rescue of the citizens of Texas; immediate activities of war would begin, as they should, and this entirely contrary to the provisions of the treaty. This is not a theoretical proposition, but a condition that may develop at any time, as it has many times in the past.

There are so many potential dangers embraced in this document that the more I study and contemplate it the more convinced I become of its menace to our Government. But some have said that unless it was adopted it would break the heart of the world. I can not subscribe to this sentiment. But, if true, I would rather "break the heart of the world" and save and preserve my own country than to shatter the heart, soul, and hope of America in attempting to stimulate the heartbeats of the world.

The labor question is by far the most vital one before the country. Since Part XIII of the peace treaty is presumably in the interest of labor, not much careful scrutiny has been given it until recently, when it was so well explained by the able and eloquent senior Senators from Wisconsin and Colorado [Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. THOMAS].

To my mind, however, that section contains possibilities of harm to American labor and infinite danger to American industry. I believe we should give the most deliberate consideration to the subject before we decide that the United States can progress through political alliance with the socialistic movements of all Europe.

Roughly, and very briefly put, the provisions of Part XIII of the treaty establish a permanent organization of labor, recognized by the peace commission, international in membership, members to be chosen from the nations in the league, the organization to consist of a general conference and an international labor office. The general conference of representatives are to meet yearly—often if necessary—four representatives from each nation appointed by the Government—one appointed by the Government to represent the Government; one appointed by the Government but nominated by employers to represent them; and one appointed by the Government to be nominated by the workpeople to represent them.

Please bear in mind, therefore, that the probable size of such conference would be more than 100 delegates. Since all 27 signatory nations, all 13 States invited to become such, and 6 States that later may be invited—a total of 46—will furnish these delegates. The international labor office controlled by 24 persons, 12 representing the conference, 6 representing employers, 6 representing the workers; 8 of the 12 representing the Governments to be nominated by nations which are of chief industrial importance. This governing body will elect its own chairman, regulate its own procedure, fix its own times of meeting, appoint its own director. The director will appoint his own staff to carry out the functions of the international labor office, which include the collection and distribution of information on all subjects relating to the international adjustment of conditions in industrial life and labor. Also the editing and publishing in French and in English and in other languages, if the governing body thinks desirable, of a periodical paper dealing with the problems of industry and employment of international interest.

This gives a general idea of the scope and character of the organization, and when we see the possibilities of such an organization—as affecting our own country, bearing in mind the conditions existing with us at the present moment, and the tendency in the future, not conditions existing in the European countries and the tendency of their national labor movements—we can judge of its injury to American labor. As all know, the trend is strong in Europe toward the nationalization of all private capital and industry—toward socialism, and almost Bolshevism. In those countries already the wageworkers want to rule more and more, and year by year the recommendations and proclamations of their trade-unions are strongly socialistic.

As proof of this let me cite the fact that last July, when delegates met at Amsterdam to reorganize the International Trade Union Congress, after the congress had been adjourned, the delegates, with the exception of the United States, reassembled into a socialistic conference. As I said before, the American labor movement was not represented, and here in the United States we feel that the labor-capital problem can be solved. Although there are differences between manual wage earners and the capitalists, yet these differences we feel can be reconciled. But the difference between capitalism and socialism, particularly that extreme form of socialism called Bolshevism, can not be reconciled, and the question for us to raise is whether this proposed labor organization called the International Labor Conference will actually bring labor and industrial management in this country into closer sympathy and understanding, or will it simply promote the doctrine and the cause of socialism, even Bolshevism?

In the light of the fact that an international trade-union congress openly declared itself for a socialistic congress, it would seem to me that it were well for us to consider this matter most attentively.

For we in the United States are not yet ready to say that the final decision in all questions of labor law and labor protection belongs to the workers themselves. The social currents in our country are not yet wholly prosocialistic nor wholly anticapitalistic. This is not true in the European countries. Even conservative England's tendencies are strongly prosocialistic, and surely the workers of our country are not prepared to be bound by laws imposed on them by representatives of other countries whose ideals are contrary to our ideals. As an example: England has declared for the nationalization of its coal mines. This international labor conference could arrange for a discussion of the subject, and upon approval of the principle by two-thirds of the delegates voting, our Government, and each of the other Governments represented in the league, would be forced to place the matter before the Congress, and the full force of all the machinery of the international labor office, with its opportunity for world-wide publication, could be utilized for adopting the proposition, and these matters are important alike to capitalists and workers.

Another way in which the treaty provisions can operate against us is found in article 407, which provides that independent alliances may be formed between the various groups of labor and employers—and these may easily be in competition with America in foreign trade. And I see another hazard to our Government in the wonderful opportunity for the dissemination all over the face of the globe of the doctrine of socialism.

If you will recall my words regarding the functions of this international labor office, you will readily see what a splendid chance is afforded for spreading the gospel of socialism through this channel, and America will be forced to go Europe's way rather than to go her own way, which has heretofore proved so successful. For with an overpowering voting strength against her the United States delegates would be unable to lead and direct the European delegates, and would in turn have to be led and directed the European way; and I contend, and shall continue to contend, that we can do more for Europe by remaining independent and acting independently in these matters and proving to the world by our own success the worth and strength of our stand. For surely no close national understanding can ever be created between American labor and American capital if yearly the subject is to be opened up and action taken by influences that are un-American and contrary to the American ideals.

American workmen are to-day receiving higher wages and living under better conditions than any other class of laborers in the world, and in many countries which would be represented in this international congress the wages paid manual labor are less than one-tenth that paid the wageworker in this country.

I can not permit this provision to be passed without protesting against such unfair competition as would surely come to the American workmen, and whatever consideration may be given this I believe that if the laborers of our country knew and understood well its provisions they would unanimously favor its removal from the covenant.

Some have said that my policy is not constructive, and that I have nothing to offer in place of the covenant. I have this suggestion to make, which I believe worthy of consideration—that instead of a document embracing 535 pages and 80,000 words I believe in a resolution declaring that we are at peace with Germany, not even stating that the war is over, simply declaring that we are at peace, and that the treaty which had been in effect since 1787 and which governed our Nation

prior to the declaration of war is again our controlling covenant. This would be a business man's proposition. There would be no involved meanings, no complex phrases; the language would be plain and unmistakable. The humblest citizen of the land would know precisely what was meant. Under that treaty for 130 years no criticism was uttered. It proved satisfactory to both Governments. No time of the Senate need be spent in discussing its provisions, but it could be accepted and approved and it would effectively clear our skirts of all alliances with the Governments overseas.

I realize that in these trying days of readjustment and restlessness there is a feeling of fear lest civilization fall us, our Government deteriorate, and our cherished institutions be shattered. I share no such fear or foreboding. This is not the first crisis in our country's history. In 1865 I recall that men trembled with fear lest the Union be severed, and the old temple of liberty was shaken to its very foundation. Was that fear warranted? No. The great middle classes, the men from the farms and the homes, patriotic and loyal citizens who believed in the Union and in right, joined hands and forces. They came from all parties and creeds. They chose a leader who was born on a farm, who could build a log cabin and fence his acres with rails, and who later built the citadel of individual, universal, and unconditional freedom and fenced it with the strong arm of constitutional law. And history repeats itself. To-day the farmers of this country are interesting themselves in the vital questions which confront us, are forming their opinions, and seeking their leader. And I have an abiding faith that in the solution of this problem—perhaps the greatest that was ever presented to a people—the Members of this Senate, representing the highest, finest type of citizenship, will preserve the principles which have been bequeathed to us by former generations and will give to posterity not a mongrel flag of international character and a Nation weakened by its alliance with other governments of the earth, but a Nation whose beneficent charity shall be the hope of the poor and oppressed of every land; a Nation whose example shall be the guiding star shedding the light of truth, righteousness, and eternal justice; a Nation complete in its own majesty and greatness, with one purpose, one Government, one flag!

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrison	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Henderson	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Moses	Smoot
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	New	Spencer
Capper	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Thomas
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Townsend
Dillingham	Kendrick	Page	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Keyes	Pittman	Warren
Fernald	Kirby	Poin Dexter	Watson
Fletcher	Knox	Pomerene	Williams
France	La Follette	Ransdell	Wolcott
Gay	Lodge	Sheppard	
Hale	McCormick	Sherman	
Harding	McCumber	Simmons	

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are detained from the Senate by illness. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent on account of illness in his family. The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are detained on public business. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] are absent on official business. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has gone to Massachusetts to vote in the State elections.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

[Mr. SHERMAN addressed the Senate in continuation of the speech begun by him on Friday last. After having spoken for over an hour he yielded the floor for the day.]

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business with closed doors.

The motion was agreed to, and the doors were closed. After 10 minutes spent in executive session with closed doors, the doors were reopened.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, November 4, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 3, 1919.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Norman H. Davis, of Tullahoma, Tenn., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Dr. Leo S. Rowe, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, November 3, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of life, with its hopes and precious promises, we stand before Thee in awe and reverence, in the presence of death; so inscrutable, wrapt in profound mystery, we could not stand the shock but for our faith and confidence in Thy love, the essence of Thy being.

When a child is born into the family, there is joy and all the affections of the heart are centered upon it. But when death enters the house, there is grief, profound sorrow and lamentations; hence our hearts go out in deepest sympathy to the parents, grand-parents, and kinsfolk, in the going of the little Champ Clark Thompson.

Especially do we sympathize with his distinguished Grandfather, who has been closely identified with this House for more than a quarter of a century—a Speaker, who served it for eight years and endeared himself to this Representative Body, in his wisdom and fair dealing with all.

Comfort him and all who are mourning the loss of the dear one, upon whom love was centered, with the hope that sometime, somewhere, they shall meet him to love and cherish forever. In the name of Him who died on Calvary, the earnest of the immortality of the soul; and glory, and honor, and praise be Thine forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, November 1, 1919, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Wednesday. I make that request, Mr. Speaker, by reason of the fact that many Members are away attending elections in various States.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent, pending that, that I may address the House for 35 minutes as soon as this is passed.

Mr. MONDELL. Thirty-five minutes, when?

Mr. ASWELL. Now, when the gentleman is through.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall be compelled to object to that, Mr. Speaker, because that will break into the important public business of the day. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman should make my request, made on behalf of the whole House, dependent on a personal request. I am not making this request on my own account. I shall be here just as long as Congress is in session. I will be in town, anyway.

Mr. ASWELL. I reserved the right to object.

Mr. MONDELL. I make the request I do on behalf of many gentlemen who feel they must be home election day.

Mr. ASWELL. I reserved the right to object. I do not intend to object. I wish, if I may, to speak for 35 minutes after this.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall have to object to that, for the reason that there is important business before the House under a special rule, and it is not fair under those circumstances to allow 35 minutes of political debate.